

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, May 4, 1918.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Infinite Source of light, life, and love, we seek Thee in prayer, that by Thy grace we may be able to resist evil and cleave to that which is good and with persistent energy and untiring zeal go forward with the work Thou hast appointed us to do, without the fear or favor of men; in the spirit of the Master. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

THIRD LIBERTY LOAN IN ARKANSAS.

Mr. TILLMAN rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. Speaker, my State and district have made such remarkable records in the matter of the third liberty loan that I desire to insert a few figures in respect to it in the Record.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arkansas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record in respect to the liberty loan in Arkansas. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to say in this connection that my State has gone far over the top in the third liberty loan, and the third district, which I have the honor to represent, has likewise far exceeded its quota. My home town and county have exceeded its quota by 50 per cent; every county and practically every township in my district has more than met the requirement as to subscriptions for liberty loans and war-savings stamps. My people are 100 per cent Americans.

I publish a letter on this subject from my home town, and also give a few facts about my State, the best and most progressive State in the Union:

LIBERTY LOAN ORGANIZATION OF WASHINGTON COUNTY,
Fayetteville, Ark., April 29, 1918.

Washington County, Ark., is 50 per cent oversubscribed.

In the first week of the third liberty loan campaign, this county bought its entire quota of bonds, \$416,750; at the end of the second week (beginning of the third) our county chairman notified both the State chairman and the district manager that we were then 25 per cent oversubscribed. It is now 50 per cent over, and we have a large enough number to entitle us to an honor flag. The messages mentioned above seem to have been overlooked, and the object of this letter is to correct the misrepresentations being made in Arkansas Legion bulletins.

Respectfully,

BRUCE HOLCOMB, Chairman.
W. J. HAMILTON,
Director Publicity.

Quota	\$416,750
Already subscribed (still climbing)	\$628,000
Number of subscribers (still climbing)	2,500

The State of Arkansas has few millionaires, no poorhouses, possesses the only diamond mines on this continent, the hottest springs in the world, and the greatest pearl fisheries in the country.

A truly remarkable State and a highly prosperous one is Arkansas. From her bauxite mines is made 90 per cent of the aluminum used in the United States.

From her coal mines comes smokeless coal used by the United States Navy.

In Pike County is the largest Elberta peach orchard in the world—3,500 acres under one management. Benton and Washington Counties have a larger acreage in apple orchards than any other two counties in the United States—10,000,000 trees. In rice production Arkansas ranks third in the country, with a yield of 6,312,000 bushels in 1916—worth \$6,110,000 to the farmer and an increase in production over 1915 of 1,470,000 bushels.

Arkansas's cotton crop alone brought \$73.54 to every man, woman, and child in the State.

After supplying a good part of the food for its 1,750,000 people, the farmers of Arkansas in 1916 received \$272,351,500 from their surplus crops.

Arkansas's farm crop for 1916

	Quantity.	Price.	Total.
Cotton, bales.....	1,145,000	\$0.18	\$103,050,000
Cotton seed, tons.....	570,000	45.00	25,650,000
Corn, bushels.....	46,800,000	1.20	56,160,000
Wheat, bushels.....	1,856,000	1.50	2,784,000
Oats, bushels.....	6,846,000	.75	5,134,500
Hay, tons.....	429,000	15.00	6,435,000
Rice, bushels.....	5,115,000	1.00	5,115,000
Peas and beans, bushels.....	600,000	3.00	1,800,000
Apples, barrels.....	2,000,000	2.50	5,000,000
Cantaloupes.....			500,000
Potatoes, Irish, bushels.....	1,620,000	1.50	2,430,000
Potatoes, sweet, bushels.....	2,730,000	.75	1,365,000
Peanuts, bushels.....	1,000,000	.75	750,000
Peaches, crates.....	4,000,000	1.50	6,000,000
Berries, crates.....	1,500,000	1.50	2,250,000
Garden vegetables.....			12,500,000
Dairy products, surplus.....			5,000,000
Molasses, gallons.....	1,000,000	.50	500,000

Arkansas's farm crop for 1916—Continued.

	Quantity.	Price.	Total.
Poultry products, surplus.....			\$5,000,000
Honey and beeswax, pounds.....	1,000,000		112,000
Cattle, head (increase).....	338,000		6,720,000
Hogs, head (increase).....	1,589,000		10,224,000
Horses and mules, head (increase).....	75,000		7,500,000
Sheep, head (increase).....	124,000		372,000
Total.....			272,351,500

Added to this wealth of production was \$40,640,000 contributed by the pine and hardwood forests in lumber and building material; \$6,603,845 supplied by the mines in coal, lead, clay, zinc, manganese, bauxite, and stone; and \$114,897,000 more by its 2,025 factories, mills, and other industries.

"FOR GOD'S SAKE, HURRY UP!"

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for not to exceed 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent to address the House for not to exceed 10 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, upon what subject?

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, I desire to discuss the post-card offensive launched against the membership of this House telling us to hurry up.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, during the last few days Members of this House have been subjected to a post-card offensive bringing to us the last words of a distinguished American statesman and diplomat, "For God's sake, hurry up!" "The tongues of dying men enforce attention like deep harmony," and anything spoken by the eminent Joseph H. Choate will always receive the utmost respect and consideration from the American people.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if this offensive were launched to impress upon us the seriousness of the hour, the danger, the horror of German domination, we submit without protest, just as every patriotic man who is doing all he knows how to do for his country welcomes any suggestion which shows him how he may do a little better. But if this hurry-up offensive is intended to imply that the House of Representatives has failed in a prompt, patriotic, and vigorous performance of its duty to the American people, I for one repudiate such implication utterly. Why should this House of Representatives be told to hurry up? Let any man name one demand which has had the solid backing of the American people which we have put aside. Surely there have been times when it seemed we might have acted with less debate, but it must be remembered we are laboring under responsibilities, larger by far than the wildest dream of any American before this war broke upon the world. Our predecessors in this Chamber were called upon to raise revenues counted in millions. We must provide for the raising of billions. Is it surprising, indeed, is it not natural, that a note of warning is heard as we proceed in the performance of these unprecedented duties?

What does the record show? It shows that this Congress has enacted by far more legislation than any Congress since the Civil War, and yet we are told to "hurry up." [Applause.] The Committee on Rules since we organized have authorized 26 favorable reports. Of course, a few of these reports—perhaps half a dozen—were not presented to the House, but the time consumed in debating all reports which have been presented is not equal to one legislative day [applause], and yet members of the Committee on Rules are told by the signers of these post cards to "hurry up." Oh, no, Mr. Speaker, it is not necessary to urge this House of Representatives to hurry up.

If I may be pardoned for speaking of the committee of which I am a member, I will say here and now that every one of the 12 members of the Committee on Rules is ready every minute to unite in instant and unanimous report to bring before the House any measure necessary to aid in winning the war. We have with the utmost determination and promptness responded to every proper demand. No man need tell us to hurry up, but God bless any man who can tell us how we can make better time.

Mr. Speaker, there were differences among us in the beginning of this war. But there is one proposition about which there is now no division in this Chamber. Germany may as well understand that America will never submit to a peace dictated by Berlin. Oh, it wrings the heart to think of the horrors of a prolonged war. May the good God be moved to look down with pity and put an end to the bloody work. We do not wish to kill; we would not destroy anything needful or useful to our fellow

man. But Americans know now, if they have not realized heretofore, that free America can not survive if Germany wins. And we will not submit to German domination or to any foreign domination. We will not be slaves if the war lasts for a generation and consumes all of our wealth. Our wealth is not worth having if we are not free. I do not believe there is a man in this Chamber who would hesitate to give all he has, if it shall become necessary to give all, in order to win; and I will say something more. It is much easier to talk than to act. When I see these boys getting ready to go to the front, cheerful and smiling, I can not help wondering if I, too, could go cheerful and smiling if I were called upon to do so; but, as God is my judge, I do not believe there is a Member of this body, from the Speaker down, who has a son wearing the khaki who would not, if he could, take the place of his boy if by doing so he could save that boy. I say no man knows for certain what his conduct would be until he is called upon to act; but I am just as firm in the conviction that every father in this Chamber would, if he could, take the place of his boy at the front as I am that I am living here and now.

Mr. Speaker, I do not trespass very often upon the time of the House, but when I see a body of 435 men ready, anxious, eager to do their full duty with a common purpose in view, who up to this good hour have acted promptly and with singular unanimity. I can not help feeling it is strangely out of place for some organization to put in motion a post-card chain addressed to the membership of the House of Representatives telling us, "For God's sake, hurry up!"

Mr. LITTLE. I ask unanimous consent of the House to proceed for another five minutes, in view of the interruptions.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to speak for five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia objects.

Mr. NEELY. Regular order!

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. FLOOD. That is all right, if the gentleman chooses to delay an important bill, such as the passport bill, in order to get five minutes, he can raise that question.

The SPEAKER. This is not debatable. The gentleman from Kansas makes the point of order that there is no quorum present, and evidently there is none.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the gentleman withdraw his point. I move a call of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina moves a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Bacharach	Flynn	LaGuardia	Rowe
Baer	Focht	Lee, Ga.	Rowland
Barkley	Fordney	Leibach	Sanders, La.
Barnhart	Foss	Lever	Sanders, N. Y.
Borland	Fuller, Mass.	Linthicum	Schall
Brodbeck	Gard	Littlepage	Scott, Pa.
Browning	Garland	Lobeck	Scully
Brumbaugh	Godwin, N. C.	Longworth	Shackleford
Burroughs	Goodall	McAndrews	Sherley
Campbell, Pa.	Gould	McFadden	Shouse
Carew	Graham, Pa.	McLaughlin, Pa.	Siegel
Carter, Mass.	Gray, Ala.	McLemore	Siepm
Clark, Pa.	Gray, N. J.	Maher	Smith, T. F.
Cleary	Green, Iowa	Mann	Stafford
Coady	Gregg	Miller, Minn.	Steele
Cooper, Ohio	Griest	Mondell	Stephens, Nebr.
Cooper, W. Va.	Griffin	Moore, Pa.	Sterling, Ill.
Copley	Hamill	Morin	Sterling, Pa.
Costello	Hamilton, N. Y.	Mott	Sullivan
Curry, Cal.	Haskell	Mudd	Sumners
Dale, N. Y.	Hawley	Olney	Sweet
Dale, Vt.	Heaton	O'Shaunessy	Swift
Darrow	Heintz	Overmyer	Tague
Davis	Holland	Palge	Talbot
Delaney	Hood	Phelan	Temple
Denison	Howard	Platt	Templeton
Dewalt	Humphreys	Polk	Thompson
Dies	Husted	Porter	Tinkham
Dillon	Hutchinson	Powers	Vestal
Donovan	Jacoway	Price	Voigt
Dooling	Johnson, S. Dak.	Ragsdale	Waldow
Drukker	Jones	Ramsey	Watson
Dunn	Kelly, Pa.	Reavis	Ward
Eagan	Kennedy, R. I.	Riordan	Watson, Pa.
Estepinal	King	Robbins	Winslow
Fairchild, R. I.	Kraus	Robinson	Woodward
Fairchild, G. W.	Kreider	Rogers	Zihlman
Farr		Rose	

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CRISP in the chair). Two hundred and seventy-eight Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Doorkeeper will open the doors.

PASSPORT REQUIREMENTS.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the bill H. R. 10264. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLOOD] is recognized, and has 25 minutes remaining of his time.

Mr. FLOOD. I understand the gentleman from Wisconsin wanted five minutes. I can yield to him now.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BLAND].

Mr. BLAND. As I understand it, I am not required to confine myself to the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will state that under the rules of the House when there is a discussion in the House, if the point of order is made the discussion has to be confined to the bill. The Chair is not going to make the point.

Mr. BLAND. I understood there was such an agreement between the two gentlemen.

Mr. FLOOD. No point will be made.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is not going to make any.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the understanding was between the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLOOD] and myself that the gentleman from Indiana might speak out of order for five minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Indiana is recognized for five minutes, the discussion not to be confined to the subject matter of the bill.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I would like the attention of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLOOD]. I have received requests aggregating 20 minutes for general debate. That is all I will ask. One gentleman wants three minutes, and the others make the aggregate 20 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my time may be extended 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent that his time be extended 30 minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. Does the gentleman yield any of that time?

Mr. FLOOD. I am going to yield, amongst others, 15 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUDDLESTON].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has already put the question and has stated that there was no objection.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I was on my feet.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair did not see the gentleman, and the gentleman did not address the Chair.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I think I did, but in such a modest way that the Chair did not hear it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will put the question again. Did the gentleman object?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I rose to reserve the right to object, and I wanted to inquire if I could not arrange to offer an amendment. I understand the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLOOD] intends to move the previous question at the end of his time, and I want to have an agreement that I can offer an amendment during the 15 minutes he gives me.

Mr. FLOOD. I think the gentleman will have that right. I will offer no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman asks unanimous consent that his time be extended 30 minutes, that he proposes to yield 20 minutes of his time to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] and 15 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUDDLESTON], and that the gentleman from Alabama be permitted to offer an amendment and have it pending?

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FESS. May I ask whether the gentleman from Alabama may not offer his amendment in his 15 minutes, whether anybody objects or not?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rules, when time is yielded to a person for debate he does not have the right to offer an amendment. If he is recognized in his own right, he has the right to offer an amendment.

Mr. GILLET. Does the gentleman from Virginia mean by that that he does not intend any other amendment shall be offered?

Mr. FLOOD. There are a number of committee amendments. My purpose was, when we got through with the debate, to call for the previous question on the bill and amendments, and I

would suggest to the gentleman that if there are any more amendments to be offered that we arrange that now.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CANNON. I would like to see an amendment offered here to except Canada from the operations of this bill.

Mr. FLOOD. I will say to the gentleman I could not offer that amendment. The gentleman made that suggestion yesterday, and I took it up with officials of the State Department this morning, and they are very much opposed to passing a rule excepting anybody. As I stated yesterday, there are no passports required to go to Canada. It is not the expectation that passports will be required, but conditions might develop in the summer or during the recess of Congress or some time during the progress of the war that would make application for passports to Canada just as desirable as to any other country.

Mr. CANNON. Yes; and the moon might turn into green cheese.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I will have to ask for 40 minutes extension.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Now, the Chair understands the gentleman from Virginia has 20 minutes. He has yielded to the gentleman from Indiana 5 minutes, leaving him 15 minutes, and he asks that his time be extended 40 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Twenty minutes of which time is to be yielded to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Twenty minutes of which is to be yielded to the gentleman from Wisconsin and 15 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUDDLESTON], and during the occupancy of the floor by the gentleman from Alabama he is to be permitted to offer an amendment. Is there objection?

Mr. MILLER of Washington. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like five minutes and would like the privilege of presenting an amendment to the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Virginia modify his request?

Mr. FLOOD. Make it 45 minutes, then, and I will yield 25 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. MILLER of Washington. I wish to offer an amendment.

Mr. LITTLE. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would like to get 10 minutes to speak. I am not sure whether the gentleman from Wisconsin will give me that or not.

Mr. GILLET. Does the gentleman want to speak on the bill?

Mr. LITTLE. No. We have carte blanche for general debate.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I ask for that time in part to accommodate the gentleman from Kansas.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Virginia modify his request? The gentleman from Wisconsin has asked that the time be extended and that 10 minutes of the time be given to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LITTLE]. Does the gentleman from Virginia modify his request?

Mr. FLOOD. I do not.

Mr. LITTLE. I object, then.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I was to give the gentleman 10 minutes.

Mr. LITTLE. Then I will withdraw my objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will state again the request of the gentleman from Virginia. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent that the general debate be limited to 45 minutes, 30 minutes to be controlled by himself and 15 minutes to be controlled by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER], to be divided as follows: Five minutes to go to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BLAND], 15 minutes to be yielded to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUDDLESTON], 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LITTLE] and 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MILLER]; and the gentleman from Washington and the gentleman from Alabama shall be permitted to offer amendments.

Mr. BLAND. Does that include the time allotted to me?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Yes. The time has been allotted to the gentleman. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I would hesitate to discuss the matter, which I want to discuss briefly at this time, were it not for the agreement made here by gentlemen who control the time that I should speak on a matter foreign to the bill.

I want to call attention to the splendid record that is being made by the great State of Indiana in this war. The conduct of the Representatives of that State in this war Congress is

pretty well known here and properly reflects, in part, the attitude of our constituents at home. We are thoroughly in this war in Indiana. Our people realize our serious position and are united in a common cause. The Council of National Defense in Indiana was one of the first State councils of defense to have a real organization. Our county councils are, almost without exception, alive and wide awake, and permit me to digress long enough to say that we should extend to them the mail franking privilege. Our councils of defense are characterized by the elimination of politics. The present national chairman of the Republican national committee, Will H. Hays, was the first chairman of the State council, and on that same council was the Hon. Thomas Taggart, the ex-national chairman of the Democratic Party, and they worked hand in hand, and are still working that way, on war matters.

In Indiana we have obliterated party lines. We are foremost in carrying out the rules adopted by the Fuel and Food Administrations, and while at times they have been burdensome to our people, they have submitted with but very little complaint, and I feel justified in calling attention with special pride to the manner in which our people are making numerous sacrifices in this war. In emphasis of the nonpartisan sentiment in my State I would like to have the Clerk read in my time an article recently published in a Washington City newspaper containing an interview by the Hon. Thomas Taggart, who at one time was chairman of the national Democratic committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

"PRESENT NOT THE TIME FOR POLITICS," TAGGART—POSITION ON WAR MAIN THING, SAYS HOOSIER—WISHES BEST MEN ELECTED.

WASHINGTON, April 13.

Thomas Taggart, former United States Senator from Indiana, who has been here for several days renewing friendships, prepared the following statement for the Washington Post:

"This is no time for politics. If I had my way, I would nominate and elect the best men to Congress, regardless of their politics. We need in the Congress the best men. There are just as good men in the Republican Party as there are in the Democratic Party; men as patriotic and as able, and there are Democrats who are just as well equipped to serve as any Republicans. I would rather vote for the election of a Republican whom I knew to be all right on the war than to vote for a Democrat whom I knew to be all wrong on the war. There is a time, perhaps, to play politics, but this is not the time. What we need is a Congress that will back up the President and the Government.

"This is war and the people are coming to realize it. Politics should be put aside and only men whose loyalty is undoubted and who are fitted to serve should be elected. That's the view our people out in Indiana are taking. Everybody is for supporting the Government. Of course, there are some Republicans who think they will win in the congressional elections this year and some Democrats who think they will win. For my part, I don't much care.

"What I want is to see the best man elected. Hoosiers—men, women, and money—are behind the war in earnest, with a full realization now, if never before, that it is up to the United States to bear the burden of the struggle."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, a large number of the Members of the Massachusetts delegation in this House take pride in the fact that they saw service originally in the Massachusetts House of Representatives. There were interesting exercises there day before yesterday, when a service flag for the members who had gone from the house of representatives in Massachusetts was dedicated appropriately. I desire to call the attention of this House to those exercises, and ask that we follow here the very worthy example set by the house in Massachusetts, namely, to dedicate a flag in this body to the Members who have gone from it in the service of their country, one of whom has given the supreme sacrifice of his life. [Applause.]

And in this connection, Mr. Speaker, I also wish to call attention to the fact that the flag back of the Speaker's rostrum is not the official flag of the United States. The stars in that flag are of gilt and should be of plain white. There is no authority for the use of gilt stars in the official flag of this country.

On June 14, 1777, Congress passed an act designating the Stars and Stripes as the national flag of the United States. The Federal law read:

Resolved, That the flag of the United States be 13 stripes, alternate red and white; that the Union be 13 white stars in a blue field, representing a new constellation.

Thus, it is noted, the thirteen original States designated the national colors and commemorated themselves in the 13 stars and 13 stripes. Later an act was passed authorizing the addition of a new star for each State admitted to the Union. The number of stars has grown until to-day there are 48 in the flag

In commemoration of the act of Congress in 1777, June 14 each year is now celebrated as Flag Day throughout the United States.

If there ever was a time when this House ought to sit under the proper Stars and Stripes it is when we are in this great contest across the sea. I therefore most earnestly wish to suggest to those having in charge the ornamentation of this room that a proper and appropriate flag be hung in this body. Gold stars look pretty, but they are not found in the official flag of the United States, and it seems to me that that correction ought to be made.

I ask leave to extend my remarks by inserting the article describing the exercises in the house of representatives in Boston.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record as indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Following is the article referred to:

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Union, May 3, 1918.]
HOUSE DEDICATES SERVICE FLAG FOR FORMER MEMBERS.

A service flag with 11 stars, for members of last year's house who have gone into the military service, presented by Mrs. John H. Sherburne, of Brookline, wife of Col. Sherburne, of the One hundred and first Field Artillery, formerly the First Massachusetts Field Artillery, was dedicated this afternoon in the house.

Representative William Foster, of Springfield, was on a committee that escorted Mrs. Sherburne into the chamber. Standing under the flag, she made a brief speech, telling of the entry of the 11 members into the war "for country, civilization, humanity, and Christianity."

Accepting the flag, Speaker Cox said:

"They have gone to service worthily and gloriously in a great cause. We honor them. While they are away this service flag shall remain not merely as a silent reminder of the splendid associations which we have lost for a time, but as a mighty inspiration for us who sit where they served to do nobly the work left undone at home, an inspiration for us to stand ready to do all and make any sacrifice, even as they, for the cause of civilization and liberty."

Chaplain Daniel W. Waldron offered a prayer of dedication, with patriotic reference to the significance of the flag and the circumstances of its presentation.

The men for whom the flag is in honor are: Capt. James Tracy Potter, of North Adams; Col. Sherburne, Daniel W. Casey, Alfred J. Moore, and Daniel J. Young, of Boston; Kenneth P. Hill, of Cambridge; Daniel W. Lincoln, of Worcester; Ward M. Parker, of New Bedford; Charles H. Slowey, of Lowell; and Maj. Roger Wolcott, of Milton.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUDDLESTON].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Alabama offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Page 3, line 12, strike out the word "enter."

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HUDDLESTON: Page 3, line 12, strike out the word "enter."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, there is a certain aspect of this bill that seems to me to be worthy of very careful consideration on the part of this House, and that is the effect of section 2 as proposed by committee amendment. That section reads as follows:

After such proclamation—

Referring to the President's proclamation—

as is provided for by the preceding section has been made and published, and while said proclamation is in force it shall, except as otherwise provided by the President, be unlawful for any citizen of the United States to depart from or enter or attempt to depart from or enter the United States unless he bears a valid passport.

It will be observed, Mr. Speaker, that the freedom of a citizen is very substantially affected by that section. He can not go out of the United States, and if out of the United States he can not return home except with permission of the President.

The act provides that he must have a passport, or he must obey such other regulations as may be adopted. The regulations, of course, are subject to change at will, and the substance of that provision is that without a passport he can not return without the President's permission.

Now, a passport can not be claimed by a citizen as a matter of right. Passports are granted only at the will of an administrative officer. No court will force that officer to grant a passport. Also, passports have no continuing effect. They may be canceled at any time. Under a statute now in effect passports may be canceled whenever the officer charged with that duty sees proper to cancel them. So that if this section is adopted as written a citizen of the United States going out of this country in possession of a valid passport may have his passport canceled and may be forbidden to come back to this country. And from that order canceling his passport and exiling him

from the country in which he was born and to which he may be altogether loyal and devoted there is no appeal. There is no recourse to a court, there is no due process of law, there is no right of trial by jury.

The Constitution of the United States is a very interesting document. It is still in force, although we are at war. I have grave doubts that this section of the bill is constitutional. It may be technically so, but undoubtedly it is violative of the spirit of the Constitution. Under the Constitution no American citizen can be exiled from his country. Under the Constitution no citizen may be deprived of his liberty without due process of law, which includes a hearing in some court. But under this provision of the bill a citizen temporarily and lawfully absent may be deprived of the right to come back to this country. He may be substantially and in effect put into exile, and without a hearing, without due process of law, without any opportunity to present his side.

It will be admitted by everyone that that is a fearful and a tremendous power to lodge in any authority. If the President could be conceived as exercising this power upon his own discretion, his own initiative, it would still be a fearful and a tremendous power. It would still be of more than doubtful Americanism. But, as we know, it is impossible for him to administer this law personally. The President will not deal with these things himself. He will not deal with them through any member of the Cabinet. He will not deal with them through any important officer of the Government. They will be dealt with through some remote subordinate, through some small clerk, through some one whose zeal may far outrun his judgment. That is absolutely necessary. When we pass this bill we should understand once and for all that we are clothing some little subordinate far down the line, who perhaps has never seen the President, with power to bar an American citizen out of his native country upon a mere suspicion and without a syllable of proof against him.

Are we prepared to go to such lengths? I want to win this war. I believe I want to win this war more than anybody wants to win it, because in addition to the reasons and the considerations that move other men I believe that I hate war worse than anybody else. I want to win so that we may have peace. One of the things for which I hate war is that it brings about just such legislation as this that is proposed. Much of such legislation is inevitable, much of it must be passed and must be submitted to. Democracies find it hard to wage efficient war. When war comes we find that the principles that democracies have long cherished and have bled for are given up one by one, little by little, piece by piece, until at last, if those who concern themselves merely with carrying on the war have their complete will, there will be left no democracy, no liberty, but only autocracy, because autocracy can wage the most efficient war.

I realize that we who love liberty must give up many things that we have cherished, and I am willing to give up mine. I give them up gladly, but I give them up with an awful and sickening fear in my soul that perhaps some of them may never come back to me and to my people. But as we give them up let us see that we give up only so much as is necessary to carry on the war. Let us not go beyond what is reasonable, what is fair, what is proper. Oh, of course, I know that if you take a third assistant prosecuting attorney he would require every man charged with crime to prove that he is innocent. He has dealt only with criminals. He feels that everybody is a criminal, and thereafter he wants all to be required to prove their innocence. Sometimes you find a man higher up, charged with the enforcement of the criminal laws, who does not hold these severe and unreasonable views. It is the same thing when we come to a man who is carrying on any enterprise. It is the same with men who are carrying on war. They want everything subordinated to carrying on war, and if a thing squints at all toward helping the war they think of absolutely nothing else. So it is with men who are chasing down disloyal citizens and who have got spies on the brain. They want everybody to be subjected to the most strenuous rules and tests. They want everybody to have to prove his innocence.

But I have not forgotten, Mr. Speaker, that this is still America. I have not forgotten what it takes to constitute Americanism. I have not forgotten that the recognition of man's right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness is what makes this country worth fighting for. I have not forgotten the Constitution, which guarantees to every citizen that he shall not be deprived of life, liberty, or property except by due process of law.

I have given myself to this war. I am fighting, so far as I can, with every nerve and every fiber of my being for America and Americanism. It is for these things and for their preserva-

tion that I am committed to this war and that I voted for it, and I mean to carry it through with every ounce of strength and every thought and every emotion that I can command. But as I carry it through I do not lose sight of the glorious things that make this country what it is and worth fighting for—liberty, democracy, the right to be a free American, to come and go, to live under the institutions for which our ancestors died. These are the things that make us willing to fight. If we are to have Prussianism here, with military courts trying citizens on suspicion, as was proposed by a recent foolish bill which the President condemned as unnecessary and unconstitutional, there will be much less for us to fight for. If we are to have men exiled without a trial; if we are to have men denied their liberty without due process of law; if we are to have native-born American citizens whose ancestors perhaps fought the Revolution, who perhaps have themselves bared their breasts to the bullets of the enemy—if we are to have such men as that, accidentally caught outside the country, prevented by some petty official from returning to their homes on a bare suspicion, without a trial or hearing, it seems to me that there will be something less to fight for than there was before.

I think it is a very serious thing to provide that an American can not go out of this country without somebody's permission, but I would be willing to concede that; but when that American is out of this country I say he ought to have the right to come back. If he has been guilty of improper conduct, punish him; if he has been guilty of treason or disloyalty, hang him. No man would be willing to go further in punishing treason or disloyalty than I would. But give him a trial under the forms of law.

Stand by the Constitution; preserve what our ancestors achieved in their struggle; keep this country as they left it, so that it may be handed down to your children as they handed it down to us. No man's liberty should be taken from him without a hearing, without due process of law. [Applause.]

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I do not share the fears entertained by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUDDLESTON] with reference to the effect of some of our legislation. However, I agree with him in his contention that the amendment which is before you should be adopted. If I did not believe that the same spirit that is causing us to wage war against Germany and Austria will cause us to return to the usual practices of peace after this war is over, I would not vote for these grants of power, and vote for them now only because we have come to conclude they are necessary for the prosecution of this war.

But while I believe with the majority in this House that it is necessary in order to successfully wage the war to vest in the executive departments wide powers in many respects, at the same time I am not willing to vest any greater or wider powers than may be necessary under the circumstances. While I am perfectly willing that citizens in order to leave the United States shall be required to procure passports, I do not believe that a citizen of the United States, who happens to find himself away from home, should be required to appeal, perhaps vainly, to some subordinate in some department for permission to return to his native country.

Now, it was argued in committee that the reason for this provision was that in some instances American citizens were in foreign countries who were suspected of being disloyal and the department did not want to permit such citizens to return to the United States.

Gentlemen of the House, these are the citizens, if disloyal, that I believe we should have within the jurisdiction of the United States and within the jurisdiction of our courts, so that they may punish them for any treasonable conduct on their part or for acts of disloyalty against the United States Government. The reason given by gentlemen from the departments was that they did not want to be bothered with them over in this country; they did not want to be required to watch them and keep track of them in the United States.

I take it, gentlemen of the House, that if there be such a citizen of the United States in Holland or some foreign country, the agents of this Government could do more to prevent him from or detect him in his disloyal activity and treasonable conduct if he were on American soil, where they would have an opportunity to detect any violation of the law on his part, than if he were in a neutral country like Sweden or Holland, where he would be at liberty to ply the activities of an enemy.

Now, for the reason that I do not believe a citizen who is loyal, a citizen who desires to return home and is faithful and true to the country in this time of war, should be required to obtain a passport to come back into the country, because I be-

lieve that if disloyal citizens be permitted to come back the United States can here put its hands on them if they have not been true to our country, I believe the words in line 12, "or enter," should be stricken from the bill, and the same words in line 13, page 3, should be stricken from the bill.

As to the provisions in the bill which propose to restrict the movements of aliens to and from the United States I heartily agree, because I take it in this time of war no alien should have the right to come and go freely over the boundaries of the United States. The proper department of the Government should have the right to control his action. But, my friends, the time has certainly not arrived when a loyal American citizen, already away from home, should not be permitted to return home whenever he may see fit to do so.

Mr. SISSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Yes.

Mr. SISSON. Under the terms of section 2 as written, suppose a citizen were in Mexico attending to business at the time the proclamation was made. Would not he be permitted to return under the provisions of the law?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. He would not, unless the President under the provisions of section 2 should make a general regulation concerning such a case, or give special permission in his case, or unless he should obtain a passport.

Mr. SISSON. How would it affect a man on official business in South America, out of the United States?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I take it, of course, that if he were there on official business he would have a passport or be given one.

Mr. SISSON. Suppose he is on official business and they should deny him a passport. Suppose, for instance, the official in Brazil, the consul, should deny him a passport?

Mr. FLOOD. It would be pretty good evidence, then, that he ought not to get back.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I will say in reply to the gentleman that, as I understand this bill, it does not mean that he shall have a passport from the Government from which he comes to the United States, but that he shall have a passport or permission from the United States to enter the United States.

Mr. SISSON. Oh, yes. He would not be permitted to take passage on a ship if in a foreign country unless he had a passport. The master of the ship would not take him unless he could land him, and we have provisions that the consuls and various officials of the United States Government at various ports shall issue passports.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I understand that.

Mr. SISSON. If I should happen to be in South Africa, would my right to return be finally determined by some little subordinate?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Under the provisions of this bill, unless the President provided by general regulations permitting the return of such individual, or granted permission in that particular case, he could be refused a passport.

Mr. FLOOD. It would go to the State Department, and not be decided by a subordinate official.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Oh, to be sure, it would go to the State Department.

Mr. SISSON. But I might be delayed in getting home.

Mr. FLOOD. Would it not be better to have the gentleman delayed in getting home than to run the risk of having a lot of traitors, who have left this country and gone to Germany, get the chance to come back here and spy on our military operations?

Mr. SISSON. But if a man is a bona fide citizen of the United States, his citizenship ought not to be treated so lightly. I am in sympathy with the bill, but I do not like to have a mistake made by excluding a man who is a bona fide citizen, born and reared here, and who is loyal to the Government.

Mr. FLOOD. There are hundreds of bona fide American citizens to-day in Germany who are not loyal to this country, and our Government knows they are not loyal to this country, and yet the gentleman's idea would be to permit them to come back here and spy on the operations of our Military Establishment and on the other operations of the Government.

Mr. SISSON. If they are not loyal and are in Germany, I agree literally with the gentleman from Texas, that this is the place where we do want them, so we might try them here in our courts and punish them.

Mr. FLOOD. There are others whose loyalty is suspected, but there is not enough evidence to convict them in a court of justice.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I dislike very much to take issue with the distinguished chairman of our committee, but another objection to this requirement is that a citizen who is in South America or any other distant country would neces-

sarily have difficulty in communicating with the State Department here in Washington and presenting the facts necessary to obtain a passport, and if, as stated by the chairman, there be American citizens in Germany who are disloyal to the Government, and whom the Government knows to be disloyal, then with that proof in an American court, within our jurisdiction, we could place them where there would be no danger of their leaving the country with or without a passport, because we would put them in prison or inflict upon them even more severe punishment. They would be guilty of treason. I am not in favor, in the case of a citizen about whom there is merely a suspicion, when there is no proof whatever, of hurling the ban, as it were, against him and preventing his return to the United States. What is suspicion? Unless suspicion is backed up by proof or by facts it becomes the most unjust and oppressive weapon that can possibly be employed. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MILLER] has five minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, line 6, after the word "States," insert the words:

"Provided, That the provisions of paragraph (a) of section 1 and sections 2 and 3 of this act shall not apply to citizens of the United States going to and from Canada nor the citizens of Canada going to and from the United States, nor shall it apply to vessels operating between the ports of the United States and the ports of Canada."

Mr. MILLER of Washington. Mr. Speaker, my district is the city of Seattle, and that country and the people are associated intimately with the development of Alaska. Our investments are enormous, the trade is enormous, and any measure which strikes at the freedom of transportation strikes at the very heart of our industrial and commercial life. Thousands travel to and from Alaska, going through British Columbia, Canadian territory. The Government is at present building an immense railroad system in Alaska. We are getting laborers there from various places in British Columbia, from the United States, from every point they can be secured. If these men all have to have passports, and every time a citizen of my town goes into the Yukon Valley—and I may say there are 60 steamers out of my city plying to various points in Alaska—it would be a great inconvenience to them. Seattle is the gateway into Alaska. It always has been and always will be. Our people go and come as between Baltimore and Washington. It is true we can make application for passports to the district court, but it would take, it is safe to say, a month for our people to get passports. I realize, and no one realizes more than I, the necessity for this law as to all countries of Europe, the neutral countries, Mexico and to Cuba.

But as to our ally on the north, Canada, with whom we have so long remained in a friendly intercourse, I can see nothing that would cause us at this time to require our people to have a passport going to Canada. It would be an extraordinary hardship upon the people of Puget Sound and the city of Seattle, being as they are so far away from the Capital of our country. It would take so much time to secure passports, I can conceive of nothing that would tend to dwarf the development of Alaska as to prohibit the free interchange of our people both Canadians into Alaska and Americans into Canada. I was in hopes that the committee would see fit to adopt an amendment of this character. [Applause.]

Mr. FLOOD. Has the gentleman from Wisconsin used all his time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 12 minutes and the gentleman from Virginia 16 minutes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL]. [After a pause.] I notice that the gentleman is not here, and I yield three minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HICKS].

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, with the indulgence of the House I desire to say a word or two in regard to the unfortunate sinking of the *St. Paul* in the harbor of New York a few days ago. Reports have been spread that at the time of the sinking the *St. Paul* was under the command of Navy officers and manned by naval crews and that the accident was attributable to this cause. I have taken the trouble to investigate the matter, and I find that the *St. Paul* at the time she went down at her dock had not been repaired at the navy yard, was not officered by Navy officers, was not manned by a naval crew, and was not under naval control or supervision, and that all reports that she was under naval management are erroneous. She had a civilian crew, under civilian officers, and the ship came from a civilian yard after being repaired under civilian supervision.

And I want to say in regard to the president of the American Line, which owns the *St. Paul*, Mr. Franklin, that he is a man of the greatest ability and experience, a man who is now rendering the most efficient service to the Government in connection with the Shipping Board. While this accident was most lamentable, it was not the fault of the Navy in any way, and in justice to the Navy I desire to make this statement. [Applause.]

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I would like to ask the gentleman if he can tell us what caused the accident? How was it brought about?

Mr. HICKS. The reports have not been made public, and I can only tell the gentleman what is surmised to be the cause, but I would prefer to tell my colleague in confidence, if he will allow me to do so.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson].

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to talk about the bill, but I am going to take five minutes to put in the RECORD some patriotic lines written by one of the employees of the House. I was requested to do this, not by the young man himself but by another Member of Congress, to whom he had shown the lines. The first is entitled "Buy a liberty bond," and is as follows:

BUY A LIBERTY BOND.

Will you respond and buy a bond
And help your Uncle Sam?
This appeals to you and appeals to me,
And should appeal to every man.
Remember the boys that are over the sea;
They are fighting for you and fighting for me.
You may not be able to follow them there,
But you can back them up by doing your share;
So get busy to-day with the liberty loan,
And help those brave soldiers and protect your home.
(James J. Kenah.)

Another poem, of a few lines, he denominates "America," and I will read it:

AMERICA.

America is stripped for action,
She's in this great world's war;
And America will win it,
For she's in it to the core.
America is honest:
She wants no gold nor land;
It's justice that she stands for;
Yes; justice she demands.
Fair Liberty has lit the world
And will continue so,
And when she strikes with all her might
She hits a powerful blow;
And when that blow's delivered
The world will safer be;
America, we wait for thee, to spread democracy.
(James J. Kenah.)

As will be seen, these lines were written by James J. Kenah, who is the chief page in the cloakroom, and I wanted to preserve the patriotism of this young man, an employee of this House, in the RECORD, because it breathes the right sort of spirit and expresses sentiments that find response in every heart here. I believe in encouraging boys to write such lines as this. [Applause.]

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, this is a very necessary bill, to fill up an unfortunate gap that now exists in our law. We have no law to prevent the travel to and from this country of American citizens of neutral or friendly nations. Our ports are open, so far as the law is concerned, to alien friends, citizens, and neutrals, to come and go at will and pleasure, and that notwithstanding the Government may suspect the conduct and the intention of the individuals who come and go. No other nation engaged in this war has gone so long without enacting a strict law forbidding people going out and coming into the country.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield for a question or two?

Mr. FLOOD. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. In reading the bill it appears that some permit or certificate other than a passport is to be given to the persons who desire to travel. That is true, is it not?

Mr. FLOOD. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. So it will be something in addition to a passport, whenever a passport may be necessary?

Mr. FLOOD. Yes; that is true with reference to aliens.

Mr. WALSH. Now, then, will the gentleman state, if he knows, upon what department or official the power to issue permits or certificates will probably be conferred by the President?

Mr. FLOOD. Upon the Department of State, in conjunction with the Department of Justice, as I understand.

Mr. WALSH. It will probably be an official who will represent both those departments?

Mr. FLOOD. Yes; or, rather, officials.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FLOOD. Yes.

Mr. SULZER. Will the gentleman state whether this law would apply to travel between the ports of the United States and the Territory of Alaska?

Mr. FLOOD. As I understand, the purpose of the department is that they will require identification of all persons going to Hawaii and Alaska or to any of the other Territorial possessions of this country. Passports will not be required, but some identification of the person will be required, so that our officials at those ports may know that the persons traveling are American citizens and not under suspicion.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FLOOD. Yes; I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I am with the gentleman on the general proposition of enforcing strictly a law of this kind; but would the operation of this law be confined to the period of the war?

Mr. FLOOD. Yes. That is on the face of it.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The President can issue the proclamation when the Nation is at war, but there is nothing in the bill limiting the time of the operation of the act.

Mr. FLOOD. It was understood that the language was intended to convey that idea, and to my mind it does convey that idea.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. FLOOD. Yes.

Mr. SULZER. Of course, Alaska is noncontiguous territory with the United States, but the travel from the Pacific ports to Alaska is identically on the same basis as travel between the States, is it not?

Mr. FLOOD. The people of Hawaii have stated the same thing. If we are to whittle away the power that we give to the Government to protect itself from spies coming in from any one section in order to prevent inconvenience to the people who go to Alaska or to Hawaii or from Washington to Canada, then we had better not pass the bill. [Applause.]

Mr. MILLER of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. FLOOD. Yes. What is it?

Mr. MILLER of Washington. Has the department ever heard of a spy coming into this country from Canada?

Mr. FLOOD. I have never heard of it, and—

Mr. MILLER of Washington. And no one else has.

Mr. FLOOD. And the department never required a passport from a person going into Canada, and they do not expect to require a passport from any person going into Canada. There is no reason for injecting this amendment into this bill, because it is not the purpose to require passports. But if a condition should develop in the future whereby the department would consider that the travel to and from Canada was dangerous to the interests of this country in the prosecution of this war, then the power to protect this country from Canadian travelers would be necessary just as it would be in the case of travelers from Mexico or any other country.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. Yes.

Mr. FARR. If they could not come in from any other country, they would try very hard to come in from Canada, would they not?

Mr. FLOOD. Yes. I think we should pass this bill and give our Government the power that every other government engaged in this war has had to protect itself from spies and informers who come to create trouble for the country or disaster for its interests, even if it does for a time inconvenience our neutral friends or friendly allies, and even if our own citizens are inconvenienced. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUDDLESTON] would like to exempt American citizens coming into this country. I can not conceive of any department of this Government intrusted with the enforcement of this law which would so far forget its functions and its duties as to subject citizens needlessly to petty annoyances who happen to be out of the country when this law goes into effect. If there are American citizens in foreign lands who are under suspicion, who have gone into Germany since this war was declared, those are people who ought to be now out of this country and kept out until the war ends. If their conduct subjects them to charges of disloyalty or treason they should be properly dealt with. But many of them have conducted themselves so that the charge of disloyalty or treason could not be sustained in a court of justice, and yet

our Government knows that they are not loyal and that their presence here would be dangerous to the country. Some are native American citizens and some are naturalized citizens, and the adoption of the Huddleston amendment would permit them to come back here without submitting themselves to any investigation. It would be dangerous to take down the bars for that class of people. It may subject individuals to inconvenience, but—

Mr. MILLER of Washington. I would like to ask if this bill has been laid before the President and has received the President's approval?

Mr. FLOOD. It has not only received the President's approval, but he has telephoned to Members of this House and advocated its immediate passage.

Mr. MILLER of Washington. As a war measure?

Mr. FLOOD. As a war measure.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. Yes.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Was that before the change was made or afterwards?

Mr. FLOOD. The President telephoned to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POU] a few days ago.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Does the gentleman know whether the President had ever read the bill or not?

Mr. FLOOD. I presume he has read it.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I understand he wants some bill; but is it this particular bill that he wants?

Mr. FLOOD. It is this bill that he wants passed in the very shape it is in and in the very shape that the gentleman from Alabama opposes.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. The gentleman does not know whether this bill has been specifically brought to his attention?

Mr. FLOOD. I do not know that the President has read every line in the bill, but I do know that representatives of the Department of State know every word in it; and the Department of Justice and the Department of Labor and the War and Navy Departments have all been trying in one way or another to keep these undesirable people out of this country and they have been unable to do so. I know that the representatives of all of these departments know the bill in all of its details and approve it just as it was reported from the committee. We have no law to protect this country, and the only protection we have now is that when people want to go out a clearance will not be given to the ship unless everybody on board has a passport. The only way to prevent these spies from coming in is through the activities and vigilance of the naturalization agents. We have no way at present of punishing the guilty or preventing them from violating or attempting to violate the regulations of the State Department in reference to passports. Those departments of the Government that I have mentioned have been for a year struggling with this question, and now their representatives and the President ask that Congress pass a law with teeth in it. [Applause.]

I hope this House will pass this bill just as it is reported, and vote down the two amendments, the one offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MILLER] and the one offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUDDLESTON]. [Applause.]

Mr. MILLER of Washington. My purpose in asking that question was this: The Delegate from Alaska [Mr. SULZER] and myself called at the White House this morning. We failed to see the President personally, but we were advised that so far as they knew the President knew nothing about this measure.

Mr. FLOOD. I do not know who gave the gentleman that information. The President has conveyed to me on two occasions his deep interest in this bill. The Postmaster General has talked to me frequently about it and said the President was very much interested in it, and that was after it was reported from the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Two days ago the President talked to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POU] over the telephone in reference to the passage of this bill, and urged that the District of Columbia appropriation bill, which was then pending, be set aside for the time being, and that this bill be put in its place and passed. He urged it on account of the great importance of this measure.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. Yes.

Mr. FESS. I am in entire sympathy with the purpose of the bill. I do not know how long the proclamation will be in force. What is the technical effect of a proclamation made in time of war? Will it cease automatically with the close of the war?

Mr. FLOOD. When the war ends the regulations will end. There is no necessity of any passport in time of peace. Our

law authorizes passports, but they are for the protection of the citizens who get the passports, who ask for them. We are asking for the passage of this law in order to protect the Government and the country.

Mr. Speaker, we have rules and regulations of the Department of State to control the travel to and from the country of American citizens, friendly aliens, and neutrals, but the rules and regulations go beyond the law and if there was a test made of them they could not be upheld.

There is no punishment for the violation of these regulations, and they are only partially enforced by resorting to methods that were not intended to meet a situation that confronts the country at this time and is a very inadequate method of enforcement. Entry into the country can only be controlled through the immigration agencies and departure from the country by denying clearance to vessels unless all of their passengers have passports.

All nations engaged in war have found it necessary to control travel to and from their countries, and when the war began in 1914 all of the belligerent nations adopted a stringent system of regulations in regard to such travel. Germany has from time to time closed her borders entirely.

Our laws are no stronger than they were in times of peace, and it exposes our country to the danger of having military information and other information of a vital character in the conduct of the war conveyed to the enemy through spies and informers, who, under our laws, can come and go without hindrance.

These spies are not only Germans, but in many instances have been neutrals, and in some instances have been renegade American citizens. Our authorities may suspect a man of being a spy, but it is very difficult to prove this fact; especially is this difficult when the man is an American citizen abroad who is desirous of coming home. A broad discretion must be vested in the Government to protect the country against this danger, and it is better to take the chance of keeping out an alien, a neutral, or even an American citizen who is perfectly innocent of any wrongdoing to the country rather than take a chance of having aliens and neutrals who are in the pay of our enemies and renegade citizens coming here and going back and forth to give information to the enemy which might result in having some of our transports sunk and our soldiers murdered, or in having some of our munition plants in this country destroyed, or to insidiously spread German propaganda, or to carry from this country information to the enemy.

The power vested in the President by this bill is broad and comprehensive, but it is essential to meet the situation that the Executive should have wide discretion and wide authority of action. No one can foresee the different means which may be adopted by the German Government and its allies to secure military information or spread propaganda and discontent. It is obviously impracticable to appeal to Congress for legislation for each new emergency. Swift executive action is the only effective remedy for such a situation.

This law is urgently needed and should be passed without delay and without opposition. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia moves the previous question on the bill and all amendments.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 3, strike out the words "that when" and insert the words "Section 1. When."

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, lines 4 and 5, strike out the words "the imposition of" and insert the word "that."

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike out the word "otherwise."

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 6, after the word "provided," insert the words "otherwise than by this act be imposed."

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 10, after the word "such," insert the word "reasonable."

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 3, strike out the word "person" and insert in lieu thereof the word "alien."

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, lines 9 and 10, strike out the words "not having permission to depart or enter, as the case may be" and insert in lieu thereof the words "with knowledge or reasonable cause to believe that the departure or entry of such other person is forbidden by this act."

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 7, insert a new section, as follows:

"Sec. 2. After such proclamation as is provided for by the preceding section has been made and published and while said proclamation is in force, it shall, except as otherwise provided by the President, be unlawful for any citizen of the United States to depart from or enter or attempt to depart from or enter the United States unless he bears a valid passport."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. To this committee amendment the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUDDLESTON] has offered an amendment. The gentleman from Alabama desires to modify his amendment. Without objection, he will be permitted to do so. The gentleman from Alabama will please indicate his amendment.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I wish to modify my amendment so that it will read as follows:

Amend the committee amendment in line 12 and in line 13 by striking out the words "or enter."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the gentleman's amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HUDDLESTON moves to amend the amendment by striking out, on page 3, line 12, the words "or enter," and in line 13, by striking out the words "or enter."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUDDLESTON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HUDDLESTON) there were—ayes 5, noes 45.

Accordingly, the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question now is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to revise and extend the remarks I made this morning.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kansas asks leave to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] calls my attention to the fact that in section 3, on page 3, in line 16, after the word "violate," it would be better to strike out the word "the" and insert the words "any of the." I ask unanimous consent to be permitted to offer that amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent to be permitted to offer the amendment which he states. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 16, after the word "violate," strike out the word "the" and insert the words "any of the."

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 15, change the section number from "2" to "3."

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 15, strike out the words "that whoever" and insert in lieu thereof the words "any person who."

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 16, strike out the words "the foregoing section" and insert in lieu thereof the words "this act."

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 24, strike out the word "conveyance" and insert in lieu thereof the word "vehicle."

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, in line 3, change the section number from "3" to "4."

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, after line 6, insert a new paragraph as follows:

"The word 'person' as used herein shall be deemed to mean any individual, partnership, association, company, or other unincorporated body of individuals, or corporation, or body politic."

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. MILLER] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MILLER of Washington: Page 4, line 6, after the word "state," insert the words:

"Provided, That the provisions of paragraph (a), section 1 and sections 2 and 3 of this act, shall not apply to citizens of the United States going to and from Canada nor to citizens of Canada going to and from the United States, nor shall it apply to vessels operating between the ports of the United States and the ports of Canada."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MILLER of Washington) there were 16 ayes and 44 noes.

So the amendment was rejected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question now is on the engrossment and third reading of the amended bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. FLOON, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

MILITARY ACADEMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11185) making appropriations for the support of the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Alabama moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the Military Academy appropriation bill.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, pending that motion, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be dispensed with.

Mr. GILLET. Reserving the right to object, may I ask for the information of the House if it is expected that after this bill passes any other legislation will be brought up this afternoon?

Mr. KITCHIN. I will say to the gentleman, no; that I will then move to adjourn.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think there ought to be a little general debate.

Mr. DENT. I will say to the gentleman that I have an understanding with my colleagues on the other side on this committee, as the gentleman from California informs me that he has several requests for time, that I shall not object to extending the time under the five-minute rule.

Mr. CANNON. With that understanding, Mr. Speaker, I do not object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The motion of Mr. DENT was then agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee in the chair.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to dispense with the first reading of the bill. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following sums be, and the same are hereby, appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the support of the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the time has arrived in this country when we must deal severely with spies, dynamiters of munition factories, and profiteers. I believe the profiteer who defrauds his country in this crisis, especially if he has a contract to furnish war materials, is a traitor to his country, should be stood up against the wall, and taken care of by the firing squad. We are asking people to buy bonds, savings stamps, to conserve food, fuel, and other materials necessary to win this war, and asking them to deny themselves that the country might more effectually prosecute the war to a successful conclusion. If we are to ask the people of this country to save, it is our duty to protect in every way possible the expenditure of every dollar so raised.

A man who would defraud his Government during this crisis is guilty of treason. He is disloyal; he is as bad as a spy. He is as bad a man as one who would blow up a munitions factory, and he should pay the awful penalty. The official who assists him is equally guilty and should suffer the same penalty.

The one who knows of such defrauding and does not disclose it to the proper official should not be handled with gloves. Alongside of the alien enemy, the disloyalist, the blower-up of munitions factories, the destroyer of war materials, the food destroyer, the preacher of disloyalty, the plotter against the country, is the profiteer, and they all should be introduced to the firing squad.

Whoever takes advantage of his country's peril in the hour of its greatest crisis is the meanest man in the country. Such a person would betray his country, would sell his family into bondage, would commit any crime known to man. The time is going to come when we will have to treat severely with spies, dynamiters, and profiteers.

If a few of these traitors were occasionally introduced to the firing squad, it would be better for the country. Let the people of this country know that the profiteer and defrauder of his country is to be severely punished and as soon as possible.

Above all, let the profiteer know that he is going to be punished and branded as a traitor and he will not be so handy in defrauding his country. He should be treated as an armed enemy. This is no hour for trifling. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

For extra pay of officers of the Army on detached service at the Military Academy.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do this to obtain a parliamentary opportunity to insert in the Record information contained in a letter which I have received from The Adjutant General of the Army, written at my request, in which he shows in detail the pay and all the so-called perquisites and emoluments of commissioned officers of the Regular Army. There have been many more or less fantastic ideas in the popular mind that in addition to the statutory pay the commissioned officer is in a position to derive financial benefit from various changes in location of posts or assignments to duty, and that there also inures to him in one way or another some kind of benefit which is hazily and loosely classed as "perquisites and emoluments." Anyone who is familiar with the subject knows that no money is paid out of the Treasury except by authority of law, and that all pay and benefits that go to any officer in the Army are in every detailed item prescribed by law.

It is only fair to say, moreover, that the pay of an officer of the Army is not by any means as substantial compensation as some people probably imagine it to be, taking into consideration the fact that the officer must furnish his own subsistence and buy his own uniforms and equipment, which latter are necessarily expensive and sometimes change in the character and type required by regulations before they are worn out by ordinary use. Besides that, it should be remembered that the Army officer has no permanent home in peace time, but is required to move, with his family, if he has one, every now and then from post to post up and down the country or across the seas, and we all know that "three removes are as bad as a fire."

All in all, his pay as it averages with his years of experience and service is probably not as favorable as the salary generally given to men of corresponding qualifications and responsibilities in civil life. It is small wonder, then, that the average Army officer can not expect to put by much, if anything, for the proverbial "rainy day," as men do in civil occupations, but is compelled, in the very nature of things, to expect that his old age will be supported only by the allowance that he will get by law upon his retirement from active service.

Without taking any further time, I will suggest that it may be to the advantage of some occasional inquirer if he can find in the Record a concise, complete, and authoritative statement of the pay and allowances of a commissioned officer of the Army.

Mr. WELLING. I would like to ask the gentleman if the pay of the cadets is in his list.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. No; they are not officers of the Army.

Mr. WELLING. What is the pay of a cadet?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Six hundred dollars a year; but the gentleman will appreciate the fact that he does not get that in money; it is a credit allowance against which certain things are charged to him on his account from time to time. If at the end of his period of instruction there is some part left, that small balance, according to long-established practice, it generally employed toward furnishing him his outfit for the service he is to enter as an officer.

Mr. DYER. How much does a young man have to deposit in the Military Academy when he enters?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I am not informed as to the present regulation about that.

Mr. DENT. I did not understand the gentleman's question.

Mr. DYER. How much money does a young man on entering the Military Academy have to deposit?

Mr. DENT. I think \$500.

Mr. McKENZIE. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I understand it is \$100, for the purpose of buying an outfit, but he gets that back. The purpose is to protect the Government from cadets coming in and only staying a short length of time.

Mr. DYER. Does he get it back after he has been there a certain time or does he have to wait until he graduates?

Mr. McKENZIE. I presume he gets it as soon as he has been there long enough so that the Government is sure that it will not be a loser.

Mr. DYER. According to the present law and practice, I understand that a young man entering the Academy has to deposit sums which run up to \$300, and it is not an easy matter for poor boys to get that sum off of poor parents of boys who enter to pay it to start with.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I understand that whatever may be the situation now—and these regulations may have been changed in regard to these deposits—it is exacted only as an earnest of good faith. It is the practice and it is the law that a cadet shall have his education and equipment during education furnished free, and in the end it amounts to that. He is supposed to be put to no expense in attending the academy.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Vermont asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks by printing the document referred to. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The letter is as follows:

PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF COMMISSIONED OFFICERS.

Pay of officers in active service.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
THE ADJUTANT GENERAL'S OFFICE.

Grade.	Pay of grade.	
	Yearly.	Monthly.
General.....	\$10,000.00	\$833.33
Lieutenant general.....	9,000.00	750.00
Major general.....	8,000.00	666.67
Brigadier general.....	6,000.00	500.00
Colonel.....	4,000.00	333.33
Lieutenant colonel.....	3,500.00	291.67
Major.....	3,000.00	250.00
Captain.....	2,400.00	200.00
First lieutenant.....	2,000.00	166.67
Second lieutenant.....	1,700.00	141.67

(a) Officers below the rank of brigadier general receive 10 per cent on the yearly pay of the grade for each term of five years' service, not to exceed 40 per cent in all.

(b) The maximum pay of a colonel is \$5,000, that of a lieutenant colonel \$4,500, and that of a major \$4,000.

(c) Ten per cent increase for foreign service of all officers serving outside the United States, except in Canal Zone, Panama, Porto Rico, or Hawaii.

Commutation for quarters when public quarters are not available and for officers who are not serving with troops.

Grade.	Yearly pay of grade
General.....	\$7,584.00
Lieutenant general.....	1,440.00
Major general.....	1,296.00
Brigadier general.....	1,152.00
Colonel.....	1,008.00
Lieutenant colonel.....	864.00
Major.....	720.00
Captain.....	576.00
First lieutenant.....	432.00
Second lieutenant.....	288.00

Commutations of heat and light when public quarters are not available, depending upon number of rooms actually occupied for certain zones of equal temperature in which the officer is serving.

Number of rooms.	Heat.		Light.	
	Minimum.	Maximum.	Minimum.	Maximum.
10.....	\$6.00	\$26.50	\$3.24	\$5.16
9.....	6.00	24.30	2.88	4.62
8.....	6.00	22.40	2.70	4.32
7.....	5.55	20.65	2.40	3.84
6.....	5.50	18.60	1.98	3.18
5.....	5.00	16.50	1.62	2.58
4.....	5.00	14.40	1.44	2.28
3.....	5.00	12.00	1.26	2.04
2.....	4.00	8.90	.90	1.44

Officers traveling by rail under competent authority when not accompanying troops receive \$0.07 a mile.

Officers sent abroad for special observation of operations at the front are allowed \$6 per day for expenses.

The lieutenant general may select two aids and a military secretary, who shall have the rank of lieutenant colonel while so serving.

An aid to a major general is allowed \$200 and an aid to a brigadier general \$150 per year in addition to the pay of his rank.

Any officer below the grade of major required to be mounted, whether permanently or temporarily, who provides himself with suitable mounts at his own expense and of his exclusive ownership, shall receive, in addition to his pay, \$150 per annum if he provides one mount and \$200 per annum if he provides two mounts. An officer claiming additional pay for providing his own mount must personally certify on each account that he was suitably mounted at his own expense and is the actual and exclusive owner of the mount or mounts in question, specifying the place at which maintained. (Act of May 11, 1908.) This addition to his pay is paid to him as a compensation for the purchase price of his mounts and is not credit allowance for the keep of the mount. (A. R. 1273.)

The Government maintains and cares for the private mounts of officers required to be mounted.

Regimental and battalion or squadron staff officers receive the pay of their respective grades on and after May 11, 1908.

While on duty that requires him to participate regularly and frequently in aerial flights, each aviation student receives 25 per cent, each duly qualified junior military aviator 50 per cent, and each duly qualified military aviator 75 per cent in the pay of his grade and length of service under his line commission.

The above covers total pay and allowances due officers of their grade from all sources.

RETIRED OFFICERS.

Retired officers receive 75 per cent of the pay of their grade (salary and increase). (R. S. 1274.) No increase of longevity after retirement unless retired for wounds received in battle. (Act of May 11, 1908.)

Retired officers are not entitled to allowances for quarters, heat, and light.

Retired officers below the grade of lieutenant colonel detailed for active duty are entitled to the full pay and allowances of their grade. Retired colonels and lieutenant colonels detailed for active duty other than at colleges are entitled to the same pay and allowances a retired major would receive under a like assignment; detailed at colleges under the act of November 3, 1893, they are entitled to the same pay a retired major would receive under a like assignment and to the allowances of their grade. (Acts of Apr. 23, 1904, Mar. 2, 1905, June 12, 1906, and Mar. 3, 1909.)

Retired officers may be transferred to the active list of the Army if under 50 years of age and with rank not above that of captain to the place on the active list which he would have had if he had not been placed on the retired list and should be carried as an additional number in the grade to which he is transferred or at any time thereafter promoted. Such officer shall stand a satisfactory medical and professional examination as now provided for by law. (Act approved Mar. 4, 1915.)

In time of war retired officers may be employed on active duty, in the discretion of the President, and when so employed they shall receive the full pay and allowances of their grade. Further, any retired officer who has or shall be detailed on active duty shall receive the rank, pay, and allowances of the grade not above that of major that he would have attained in due course of promotion if he had remained on the active list for a period beyond the date of his retirement equal to the total amount of time during which he has been detailed on active duty since his retirement. (Act approved June 3, 1916.)

The Clerk read as follows:

Four cooks, at \$38 each per month (increase \$384 submitted), \$1,524.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman a question. Ought not the language "(increase \$384 submitted)," in lines 19 and 20, be stricken out?

Mr. DENT. They should.

Mr. KAHN. Then, Mr. Chairman, I offer to amend, in lines 19 and 20, page 4, by striking out the language "(increase \$384 submitted)."

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the gentleman from California offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, lines 19 and 20, strike out the words "(increase \$384 submitted)."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WELLING. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from California what the figures "\$1,824" mean at the end of that line 20?

Mr. KAHN. That is the total for the four cooks for the year. The Clerk read as follows:

For pay of Engineer detachment: One first sergeant, at \$51 per month, \$612.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of making a few remarks on the pension question. I understand that it is the present plan of the majority to bring up the House general pension bill on next Monday under suspension of the rules. The bill as reported to the House, as gentlemen will understand, provides for a 30 per cent increase, with a minimum of \$25. It also has in section 3 two provisions to which there is a great amount of objection by the old soldiers of the country. That section provides that anyone having an income of \$1,000, including the pension, shall not be entitled to any of the increase provided for in the bill. It also provides that the inmate of any soldiers' home shall not be entitled to any increase provided for in the bill.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. Yes.

Mr. MAPES. What percentage of the old soldiers will the bill apply to if these exceptions are put in?

Mr. BLAND. A very large percentage, because the majority of them, of course, have not a thousand dollar income, and the majority of them are not in the soldiers' homes.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit, my recollection is that 19,000 of the Union soldiers of the Civil War are in the soldiers' homes, and they would not take any benefits by this increase of pension; and if the gentleman will allow me also in his time, and I think the committee will extend the time for five minutes more if the gentleman desires, these 19,000 in the national homes come from all over the country. I would not undertake to speak accurately as to the number of Union soldier survivors who are not in the homes.

Mr. MAPES. Do the 19,000 include the inmates of State homes as well as the national homes?

Mr. CANNON. I think not.

Mr. BLAND. The bill provides "State or National homes."

Mr. CANNON. We contribute \$100 a year to these State homes, as the gentleman knows.

Mr. BLAND. Yes; they are partly supported by the Federal Government. If this matter comes up under suspension of the rules, there will be no opportunity for amendment, and very little chance for debate. I think the majority of the House want to amend the bill. I feel that at this time the old soldier is the man who is hit hardest by the high cost of living. His little pittance of \$17 or \$22.50, as the case may be, does not go very far. I think it is a serious matter to which consideration ought to be given at this time, and a bill should be passed by this Congress that will give them substantial relief. The bill to be acted upon Monday provides for a \$25 minimum. I think the majority of this Congress are in favor of at least a \$30 minimum, but unless we have the opportunity of amending it and bringing it up as a privileged report or considering it under a special rule we will have no opportunity of voting for a \$30 minimum or of voting to strike out section 3.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. Yes.

Mr. MAPES. Will not the Committee on Rules bring in a rule making it in order to consider the bill so that we can amend it?

Mr. BLAND. I think they would if the matter were presented to them properly and by the proper parties. A number of that committee have signified their disposition to do so, and it is also a privileged matter. It stands to-day on the Calendar as highly privileged as any other matter before this body, and it should be presented now as a privileged matter. I do not think the matter ought to come up under suspension of the rules so as to

avoid the opportunity of amendment, but it seems that it is the deliberate purpose of the majority to do so.

Mr. ANTHONY. Does the gentleman know when it is the intention to bring this before the House?

Mr. BLAND. Next Monday, under suspension of the rules.

Mr. ANTHONY. I agree with the gentleman that it would be unfortunate to have that done.

Mr. BLAND. That is the reason why I am raising the question at this time. I think Members ought to insist that this bill be brought out under special rule or as a privileged matter.

This bill appropriates, as I remember it, and Gen. SHERWOOD will correct me if I am in error, \$29,000,000, quite a sum to pass under suspension of the rules without any consideration as to where it shall go and without any opportunity of amendment and very little opportunity for debate.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. I shall be very glad to do so.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. In answer to the suggestion made by some gentleman a moment ago touching the matter of a special rule, as one member of the Committee on Rules I have this view of the matter, that where the Pension Committee has under the general rules of the House a day every two weeks that no special rule is necessary.

Mr. BLAND. It is my understanding that that day every two weeks is for omnibus private bills and not general bills.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. It is for general pension legislation.

Mr. BLAND. No; I do not think so. I understand that the Committee on Pensions is privileged to make a report the same as the other privileged matters, and I am also informed reliably that there is no other bill on the calendar to which a higher privilege attaches. It may be brought up this afternoon and considered, and I hope amended and passed.

Mr. GILLET. If the gentleman will permit, in response to what the gentleman from Tennessee said, if it is so that the Committee on Pensions has a right every other week to bring up their bills, would not that be a strong argument against bringing it up on suspension day, because it would show that the only reason for bringing it up was to avoid any amendments?

Mr. BLAND. That seems to me to be self-evident.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. If the gentleman will permit, I am not arguing that question. I am merely saying, as one member of the Committee on Rules, I do not think a special rule is necessary or ought to be expected from that committee for a committee that has the power to legislate every two weeks.

Mr. BLAND. As I understand it, under its privileged standing on the calendar the only thing essential is recognition by the Chair—that is, on days not set apart for unanimous consent, suspension of the rules, or other special matters. If you can get recognition of the Chair, you do not need a special rule; if you can not get recognition of the Chair, you ought to have the special rule.

Mr. TILSON. May I ask the gentleman from Tennessee a question?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The gentleman from Indiana has the floor.

Mr. BLAND. I will gladly yield to my friend from Connecticut for that purpose.

Mr. TILSON. Do I understand the gentleman from Tennessee to say that on any Friday known as pension day it would be in order for the chairman of the Committee on Invalid Pensions to rise and make a motion that the House go into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of pension bills of a general nature?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. That is the provision of the rule.

Mr. TILSON. That it would have a privileged status the same as an appropriation bill on any other day?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Why, the general rules of the House provide that general pension legislation is a privileged matter.

Mr. TILSON. The gentleman is correct as to the rule of privileged matters, but not as to its being privileged by reason of the rule as to private pension bills on Friday.

Mr. BLAND. I do not think the chairman of the committee [Mr. SHERWOOD] so understands that, and I know that he has been trying to get this bill up, and I do not think he understood that he had the right to report this bill as a privileged report on pension day, but if it was entitled to be reported at all, it would be as privileged. It could be called up for consideration on pension day; but, if so, it would be because it was privileged under the rules and not because it was pension day.

Mr. SHERWOOD. It is private pension day, not general.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KAHN. I ask that the gentleman have an additional five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

HOUSE BILL AND MR. BLAND'S REPORT.

Mr. BLAND. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHERWOOD], chairman of the committee, has just stated that he understands Friday is private pension day and not for general bills, and that is the understanding of the committee, I am sure, and we have been working on that theory. I desire to insert as a part of my remarks a copy of the House bill reported by the honored chairman of our Invalid Pensions Committee, Gen. SHERWOOD, and also a copy of that portion of the report which contains my personal views on the subject:

A bill increasing rates of pensions of soldiers and sailors of the Civil War.

Be it enacted, etc., That the rate of pension of any person who served in the military or naval service of the United States during the Civil War and was honorably discharged therefrom, and who is now in receipt of a pension or shall hereafter be granted a pension under the provisions of any general law, or is now pensioned under a special act of Congress, and who is entitled to a pension less than \$25 per month, shall be \$25 per month.

In case such person has reached the age of 70 years and served 1 year, the rate of pension shall be \$26 per month; 1½ years, \$28 per month; 2 years, \$30 per month; 2½ years, \$31 per month; 3 years or over, \$32.50 per month.

In case such person has reached the age of 75 years and served 90 days, \$27 per month; 6 months, \$29 per month; 1 year, \$31 per month; 1½ years, \$35 per month; 2 years or over, \$39 per month.

That any person who served in the military or naval service of the United States during the Civil War and received an honorable discharge, and who was wounded in battle or in line of duty and is now unfit for manual labor by reason thereof, or who from disease or other causes incurred in line of duty, resulting in his disability, is now unable to perform manual labor, shall be paid the rate of \$39 per month, without regard to the length of service or age.

SEC. 2. That any person who served in the military or naval service of the United States during the Civil War and who was honorably discharged therefrom, and who is now pensioned or shall hereafter be pensioned under any general law, or who is now pensioned under special act of Congress at a rate of \$20 per month or more, shall be entitled upon the passage of this act to receive in lieu thereof a rate which shall be fixed by the Secretary of the Interior, in multiples of 50 cents, nearest approximately 30 per cent additional to the present rate: *Provided*, That no rate of pension shall be granted under the provisions of this act in excess of \$50 per month: *Provided further*, That no pension heretofore granted shall be reduced by this act.

SEC. 3. That no pensioner shall be entitled to receive any benefits under the provisions of this act for any period during which he shall be an inmate of any State or national soldiers' home, and the provisions of this act shall not apply to any pensioner whose net annual income from all sources, including his pension, is \$1,000 or more.

SEC. 4. That the increased rates of pension provided by this act shall commence from the date of the approval of said act, or in case of original pensions hereafter allowed from the date of commencement of such pensions as provided by existing laws.

SEC. 5. That no attorney shall be recognized and no attorney fees shall be paid for the presentation or prosecution of any claim under the provisions of this act.

VIEWS OF HON. OSCAR E. BLAND, OF INDIANA.

I fully concur with the views of the Committee on Invalid Pensions as to the provisions of House bill 9959 in so far as it increases fairly and equitably, though insufficiently, the amount of money to be paid to the pensioned soldiers of the Civil War. A minimum should be established, and an increased amount should be given on account of age and service. With these principles in the bill I also concur. And were it not for the extreme age and general deplorable physical disability of the soldiers of that war I would advocate but little change in this bill, but since about 37 per cent of them now on the pension rolls served more than two years, and since practically all of them are over 72 years of age, necessarily feeble and unable to perform manual labor, and since present war conditions have doubled the price of living, the amounts under the provisions of the bill appear to me to be absolutely inadequate. More than 95 per cent of the soldiers of the Union cause now on the pension roll have no income of consequence in addition to their pension.

I maintain that it is the duty of the Government to provide adequate and liberal means to cover the entire cost of supporting the surviving Civil War pensioned soldiers and their dependent families. I therefore favor a \$30 minimum for any soldier of the Civil War now on the pension roll or who may hereafter be placed on the pension roll, and I favor the recognition of age and service to a maximum of \$40 per month. And if I were convinced of the existence of a reasonable probability of obtaining a \$50 maximum I would heartily advocate it.

The following short paragraph, if enacted into law, would, in my judgment, be the fairest and most practicable bill for enactment, considering the expense and all the valuable experiences derived from the trial of past pension legislation:

"A bill to amend an act entitled 'An act granting pensions to certain enlisted men, soldiers, and officers who served in the Civil War and the War with Mexico,' approved May 11, 1912.

"Be it enacted, etc., That the general pension act of May 11, 1912, is hereby amended by adding a new section, to read as follows:

"SEC. 6. That from and after the passage of this amendment the rate of pension for any person who served 90 days or more in the military or naval service in the United States during the Civil War, now on the roll or hereafter to be placed on the pension roll and entitled to receive a less rate than \$30 per month, shall be \$30 per month.

"In case such person has reached the age of 72 years and served six months, the rate shall be \$32 per month; one year, \$36 per month; one and a half years, \$38 per month; two years or over, \$40 per month: *Provided*, That this amendment shall not be so construed as to reduce any pension under any act, public or private."

The Hon. Franklin K. Lane, Secretary of the Interior, concerning these identical figures and this paragraph, under date of February 15, 1918, says:

"The roll carries no class of survivors rated upon attained age of 72 years. It was ascertained by running through several thousand roll cards that about 75 per cent of the survivors pensioned upon the basis of attained age of 70 years were not between the ages of 72 and 75 years. The results of addition of this percentage of the 70-year class of the roll at the close of the last fiscal year to the 75-year class then on the roll by periods of service, and computation of the difference in annual rates at that time and the rates proposed by the bill, are shown in the following tabulation:

Age and length of service.	Number.	Increased cost per year.
Less than 72 years and served 60 days and over, and 72 years and over and served less than 6 months.....	2,171	\$10,670,202
72 years and over and served 6 months and less than 1 year.....	39,163	5,099,178
72 years and over and served 1 year and less than 1½ years.....	42,083	6,209,772
72 years and over and served 1½ years and less than 2 years.....	24,785	4,185,542
72 years and over and served 2 years and over.....	111,739	15,959,298
Total.....	299,941	42,104,262

"The average annual increase is about \$120. Allowance for death losses and other changes may be accepted to reduce the above total to \$40,000,000, as representing the approximate cost of the bill for the first year should it become a law."

It will be observed that the number of soldiers who are less than 72 years of age and served 90 days and those who are over 72 years of age and served less than six months is 2,171, and that the total increased cost of paying this class of men \$30 per month instead of what they are now receiving would only be \$10,670,202, and that the total increase under this proposal would only be \$40,000,000. The provisions of this above proposed bill, while not as much as was hoped for by the Grand Army of the Republic officials, who have stated their wishes to the committees of Congress having general pension legislation under consideration, it is declared to be, under the circumstances, satisfactory to them. After considerable investigation I am convinced that if the above provisions are agreed to by the House of Representatives they will soon be placed on the statute books.

If the above is enacted into law, special bills for increase of pension will be few. It will not, of course, change the number of bills for original pensions. The committee bill having a \$25 minimum will not relieve the tremendous demand for special increase bills.

I am opposed to section 3 of the bill. There are very few soldiers receiving pensions who have \$1,000 incomes. If we give the soldiers enough to live on, there will only be a few who will want to stay in the soldiers' home.

I fear too exacting proof of these two almost immaterial facts will be exacted by some unfriendly and technical departmental official, which will cause endless delay and general dissatisfaction.

The proposed bill I have offered as a substitute is an exact copy of the Smoot bill, introduced by Senator Smoot in the Senate, and which has been favorably reported by the Senate Pensions Committee.

There are 16 men on the Invalid Pension Committee and while none of them have joined me in a report recommending a \$30 minimum for the old Civil War soldier, I know that many of them feel on this question just as I do about the imperative needs of this class of soldier, and I am not attempting to pose as the only member of the committee who would like to see the soldiers affected by this bill get at least that amount of money, but my individual convictions, as well as my personal and party pledges, make it imperative that I not only strive in committee to do what I conceive to be my full duty to the soldier, but that I at least attempt to have my convictions acted upon by all my colleagues in the House.

In considering this bill, which is to increase the pensions of the soldiers and sailors of the Civil War, there are three things which I regard as fundamental:

First. The age of any survivor of the conflicts of the Civil War of itself is such as to disqualify him in almost every instance from performing manual labor. Some may earn a small wage, but, if so, it is usually from dire necessity and with great pain and misery.

Second. Regardless of what those who oppose pensions generally may say, it is a fact that most men on our pension rolls have depended upon their pensions for their support, to the extent that but few of them have any other source of income, and many of them by reason of war-incurred disabilities have never been physically able to accumulate anything for old age.

Third. The enormous increase in the cost of living, due largely to war conditions, has made the pittance received from the Government inadequate to supply the bare necessities of life for the Civil War soldier and his family.

When we are calling on our young men, the sons and grandsons of these honored heroes, to offer their lives in this the most terrible of wars; it would be a blunder and mistake to turn

a deaf ear to the cry for help from the men who saved this Republic by the offer of their lives.

The second congressional district of Indiana, which I have the honor to represent, is proud of the fact that during the days of the Rebellion it did its full duty and sent its thousands to battle for the life of the Union. It to-day is honored by having as residents within its confines more old veterans of that terrible struggle than the average congressional district. I am not sure as to the cause of this condition; whether it is wholly due to the number who enlisted from my district or whether the old fellows just love to live down there among our hospitable folks, or whether it is due to both reasons. One of my colleagues, in a spirit of jest, the other day suggested that it was because we nearly always had a Member of Congress from that district on the Invalid Pensions Committee, but I know that this can not be true.

One thing is certain; they know their Congressman's address and they know how to write, and if they are too feeble to write they get some friend to write for them, and you may rest assured that, without regard to politics or formality of long acquaintance, they have been telling me what they expect of this Congress in no uncertain terms.

My heart has ached because of the suffering of some of these men to whom we owe so much. I know they are suffering, and if you have taken time to figure out what a dollar will buy to-day you know many of them are suffering. Seventeen dollars a month, or even a dollar a day, does not go far toward providing shelter, food, and clothing for a man and his family in these days. Some of these old friends have written me what they have to eat, what they wear, what kinds of homes they have to live in, and many of them tell of doctor bills and sickness. Should we neglect these men now, who in the twilight of their honored lives look to the Government they saved for us for help, we would be unworthy of the priceless privileges we now enjoy because of their sacrifices.

Some one says, "Let them go to the soldiers' home." Yes; let them go if they have to; but I hope this great Nation, this powerful Nation they saved, will not by its neglect force them in their feebleness or old age to leave their loved ones and their places of hallowed remembrances to go to a soldiers' home, no matter how well it may be managed or however comfortable it may appear.

They are fast passing away; they will not long honor us with their presence. Every 15 minutes one of these gallant men in blue hears the muffled drum and answers his last roll call. To those who object to the \$40,000,000 increase I propose, let me say that practically all of it goes to the men over 70 years of age, and they necessarily can not be with us long. If I advocated this \$40,000,000 increase solely on the ground of governmental generosity or solely on the ground of the payment of a just debt the Nation owed to its defenders or on the ground of the value of the example to the present-day generation, in either instance I would have an irresistible and unanswerable argument. But, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I present it to you to-day not only as a generosity and a payment, but as a positive necessity, the hour of which must not be delayed.

Most of you men when in your districts back home have proclaimed your love for the soldier and have promised your support for "One dollar a day and more if necessary." Your party platforms, State and National, have slobbered all over the soldier; a very large per cent of you have introduced dollar-a-day bills and many of you have introduced them for larger sums. Now is the time to come to the front. You will never have a better opportunity. Since the close of the Civil War there never was a time when the welfare of the American soldier was nearer the hearts of Members of Congress or the American people in general than it is at this moment. But if you consider this bill under suspension of the rules you know you will not get the \$30 minimum.

If, when you consider this bill, you adopt my amendment you will get rid of section 3, which I regard not only as unjust and unfair but as impracticable and very harmful to the purposes of the act. If you will give the old soldier enough to live on he won't want to go to a soldiers' home, and the Government will be relieved of his care there, and he will be a happy, contented, and patriotic citizen and an inspiration to the people of his community.

I have opposed the provision in this section which denies the increase provided for in the bill from a soldier whose income, including his pension, is a thousand dollars or more, for several reasons. One of them is sufficient—who is going to determine how much his income is? If it is a thousand dollars this year, how much will it be next year, and the next, and so on? Do you intend to give some unfriendly administrative officer the opportunity to "split hairs" and investigate and delay and worry

these old fellows until they die with old age? If you want to give them an increase, give it to them; do not dangle it before their eyes and then withhold it.

Gentlemen, I sincerely hope that this House will give us a chance to consider this bill under a special rule or as a privileged matter so that we can amend it and that you will adopt my amendment, providing for a \$30 minimum. I will gladly vote for a \$50 maximum, and if I thought my amendment would be passed by this House containing that amount as a maximum I would have so drafted it.

Mr. MAPES. Will the gentleman yield so as to get this point of order straightened out?

Mr. BLAND. Yes.

Mr. MAPES. The rules say:

On Friday of each week, after the disposal of such business on the Speaker's table as requires reference only, it shall be in order to entertain a motion for the House to resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House to consider business on the Private Calendar in the following order—

And so forth.

I understand the bill to which the gentleman refers is on the Union Calendar, and it could not be brought up on Friday.

Mr. BLAND. That is my understanding. It could only be brought up as a privileged report, if you obtained recognition of the Chair, or it could be brought up on a rule from the Committee on Rules. I understand it is on the program to bring it up under suspension of the rules on suspension day next Monday. If that is done, gentlemen, you men who are friends of the soldiers and who feel in this time of war we ought to offer encouragement to the young soldiers by giving what their fathers and grandfathers are entitled to, will be forced into voting for a bill which, it is true, gives an increase, but which is not satisfactory, or you will be forced to vote against the passage of the bill under the suspension of the rules, and then be criticized for your failure to support an increase bill. I am in favor of bringing this matter up this afternoon before we close our labors and thrash this bill out and consider it in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and arrive at some just measure that will give the old soldiers of the country that to which they are so justly entitled. We have plenty of time this afternoon. Why not do it? [Applause.]

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. I will be very glad to yield.

Mr. CANNON. I find on examination that my recollection was correct, that under the rules of the House the business of the Committee on Invalid Pensions is privileged the same as any of the other committees.

"The following-named committees shall have the right to report at any time on matters herein stated," and there are a number of committees, including the Committee on Invalid Pensions with general pension bills, and that has been always construed, and uniformly construed, to make it in order at any time the chairman could be recognized to go into the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. BLAND. But he would have to have recognition of the Chair, would he not?

Mr. CANNON. He would have to have recognition of the Chair at any time in order to do anything.

Mr. BLAND. I do not think I am misstating a fact when I say that I think the Chair would be more inclined to recognize one who has a privileged report than one with a request for the suspension of the rules. I think, however, that there is a determination here to bring this bill up Monday under suspension of the rules to avoid amendment, and I do not think it ought to be permitted. I am glad to call attention to it at this time, so that you men who feel interested in this proposition will see to it that this House is not forced to swallow whole a bill that does not do justice to the old soldiers, and your mouths be closed from debate and you be denied the privilege of offering an amendment that will give substantial relief to the soldiers. I am calling your attention to it for that reason at this time.

Mr. McKENZIE. It takes a two-thirds vote to suspend the rules and pass the bill, does it not?

Mr. BLAND. Yes. This bill provides a 30 per cent increase. Would you vote against it, even though you knew there was some unjust features in the bill?

Mr. McKENZIE. I would not like—

Mr. BLAND. The House ought not to be put in an unfair position. We are in favor of an increase, and under such rules and regulations as will give speedy relief. For instance, if you vote for the present House bill, you will vote for a provision to prevent those who are getting \$1,000 income from getting an increase. That provision in the law will entail long investigation and long delay and an army of employees being employed who will harass these men who are entitled to these increases now while they are alive and while prices are so high.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I want to address myself to the rule under which the pension bills are considered on every other Friday; that is, under Rule XXIV, clause 6, which provides for the consideration of bills on the Private Calendar. The business of that day is confined to private pension bills and to the removal of political disabilities, and the chairman of the Committee on Pensions would not have the right on that day to call up general pension legislation such as is contemplated in the bill that has been reported by the committee. The rule reads with reference to pensions:

On the second and fourth Fridays of each month preference shall be given to the consideration of private pension claims and bills removing political disabilities and bills removing the charge of desertion. On every Friday, except the second and fourth Fridays, the House shall give preference to the consideration of bills reported from the Committee on Claims and the Committee on War Claims, alternating between the two committees.

This rule, therefore, does not give the chairman of the Committee on Pensions the right to call up his pension bill, a bill legislating generally on the pension subject, and the committee is confined entirely to bills on the Private Calendar, or what are known as private pension claims. I am sure the gentleman from Tennessee had overlooked the strictness of the rule under which the Pension Committee operates on every other Friday.

Mr. MAPES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. MAPES. Will the gentleman give us his opinion as to whether this bill is a privileged bill and could be called up by the committee at any time without a rule?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. In my judgment, yes.

Mr. TOWNER. The Committee on Invalid Pensions has the right to report at any time, just the same as the Committee on Rules has the right to report at any time a general bill.

Mr. MAPES. It has to be a privileged bill.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHERWOOD] on any Friday that he has the floor, or on any other day, could move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering this bill.

Mr. TOWNER. If the gentleman will permit me, this has the privileged status with regard to pension bills. If a general pension bill is reported it may be reported by the committee at any time under this provision which puts among the privileged reports such as those from the Committee on Rules, and appropriation bills, and also includes reports from the Invalid Pension Committee on general pension bills, so that they may be called up at any time by the chairman of the committee. Now, when it comes to private pension bills, those can not be called up at any time. They can only be called up on every other Friday under the other rule. So that we have those two privileged conditions regarding pension legislation. Now, this bill being a general pension bill, the chairman of the Committee on Pensions may call it at any time for consideration in the House.

Mr. BLAND. Clause 6 of paragraph 857 says "privileged bills reported under the right to report at any time," which includes reporting a motion for the consideration of a general bill from the Invalid Pension Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Now, upon the necessity for general pension legislation, no one will contend that the amounts now paid to the veterans of the Civil War are sufficient to meet the obligation that rests on Congress to meet the necessities of these veterans.

It is as much our duty to fully provide for their needs now as it was to provide for their needs when they were serving in the field. Mr. Chairman, the conditions have so changed, the prices of everything the veteran buys have increased to such an extent that the amount he receives is not enough to meet the merest necessities. There is no sort of contention that we ought not to keep the pledge that we made with the veterans of the war of the sixties and provide for their necessities in their old days. We are spending billions of dollars for war purposes to-day. We ought, while we are doing this, while we are paying for the war we are now waging, to have some regard for the debt we owe for the greatest war that we ever waged in our history. These men have a claim upon this country. They have a claim upon this Congress. We ought to meet that claim. While we are to-day ready and willing to spend these billions of dollars for waging a war the end of which no one can yet see, we ought at the same time to take

a day off and provide for the necessities of the men who made it possible for us to have a country.

A rule is preferable to a motion to suspend the rules to pass a bill if a rule were necessary, but under the privileged character of the bill, as stated by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER], a motion to suspend the rules ought not to be made on this bill.

There ought to be an opportunity to strike out section 3 of the bill that provides that no pension under it can be paid if the veteran has an income of a thousand dollars a year or is in a soldiers' home, and this section could not be stricken out under a motion to pass the bill under suspension. Every one of the claimants would be subjected to an examination with that section in, and, as stated by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BLAND], there would be literally hundreds of men in the field investigating every claimant to find out what his income was, whether it was \$800 or \$900 or \$1,000 or \$1,500. And if he had no income at all, still his claim would not be allowed until that matter was fully investigated to the satisfaction of the bureau, after an examination by an inspector.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, as chairman of the Committee on Invalid Pensions I have perhaps made more of an effort to be recognized to bring up this bill than any Member of this House is aware of. I think I understand the whole situation. I tried to get a rule from the Committee on Rules. I have twice seen the chairman of that committee, and he partly promised to give as a rule.

I am in favor of allowing any amendment that the House wants to offer to this bill, but before I can bring in this bill, notwithstanding its privileged character, I must have recognition, as stated by my distinguished friend from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], from the Speaker, and the Speaker has agreed to give me recognition whenever these important war measures are disposed of.

Now, in looking through the RECORD I find that on the 10th day of January, 1911, Mr. Sulloway, through Mr. FULLER, reported what is known as the Sulloway pension bill under a suspension of the rules. The vote on that bill, as I remember, after debate of 20 minutes on a side, was 212 for the bill and 62 against. There was no record vote by roll call. There were over 200,000 more soldiers alive at that time than there are to-day, and several gentlemen on the floor undertook to offer amendments and Mr. FULLER objected, and no amendments were allowed. As I understand the rules, anything can be done by unanimous consent, and so far as I am concerned individually—and I propose to have charge of the bill—I would be willing to give the House a chance to offer amendments if it can be done under the rule.

I do not think I need to say to the Members present that I am, and have been consistently, in favor of liberal pensions to my old comrades. In 1906 my district was Republican at the previous election by 18,642, and the Democrats wanted me to go on the ticket and run for Congress. I did not care to go back to Congress only as I thought I might be of some service to the comrades with whom I stood elbow to elbow for four years of that terrible war. [Applause.] On a vote of 62,000 I was elected by a plurality of 42. I never asked a soldier to vote for me in my life. I never wrote a letter to a soldier asking him to vote for me. I never wrote a letter to an individual asking him to vote for me. I never accepted a dollar from any private individual or any corporation in any of my campaigns. I never had the support of any Democratic daily newspapers, because we did not have any in our district. [Laughter.] On December 7, 1907, two days after I took my seat in the Sixtieth Congress, I introduced what is known as the Sherwood dollar-a-day pension bill, and I worked for that bill through the Sixtieth Congress, the Sixty-first Congress, and the Sixty-second Congress—in all, over four years—and on the 11th day of May, 1912, after a struggle, I think, of three days on the floor of this House, we passed the bill. It went over to the Senate. The Senate passed what was called the Smoot bill.

I have always believed that a pension should be for service or disability. I believe that the pension roll should be a roll of honor, and I have always felt that way ever since the war, and I feel that way now. Then we had conferees appointed between the Senate and the House. I was chairman of the conferees on the part of the House. Mr. McCUMBER was chairman on the part of the Senate, and we labored for four months to perfect the bill. As I said before, that bill was adopted on the 11th of May, 1912, and was signed by the President and became a law the next day. It was signed by President Taft and is now the law.

If there is any gentleman here who can tell me what I can do more than I have already done to get this bill up, I would be glad to do it. We have the precedent of the Sulloway bill, which passed under the suspension of the rules, and which carried \$75,000,000, and which was based on an entirely new line. No country in the world up to that time, or any representative or parliamentary body up to that time, had ever passed a soldiers' pension bill based solely upon age. In my opinion there is no virtue in being old. If there was, I would be the most virtuous man in this House. [Applause.]

Mr. BLAND. Would the gentleman prefer to have the bill come up as a privileged bill rather than under suspension of the rules?

Mr. SHERWOOD. I would if I could get recognition now, in order to speed its passage into law.

Mr. BLAND. Does not the gentleman think he could get recognition a little later. If he would let the bill go over and not consider it under the suspension of the rules on Monday?

Mr. SHERWOOD. I am receiving so many letters in favor of the bill and urging its passage that I want to get it out of the way. I do not think it makes much difference what kind of a bill we pass in the House, if we can only get it into conference, and I will guarantee that we will give you a satisfactory bill if we ever get the bill into conference.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERWOOD. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Ohio be extended two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I hope at the expiration of that time we may go on with the reading of the Military Academy appropriation bill.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. The gentleman from Ohio moves to suspend the rules and include in that motion a proposition to strike out section 3. Would the gentleman be willing to do that?

Mr. SHERWOOD. I will tell you. There are 16 members of the committee. When this bill that is now on the Union Calendar was considered, it was ordered to be reported by the unanimous vote of those present. Twelve members of that committee were present, and I would not take the responsibility of deciding for the other 15 members of the committee what to do, because I am only one member of the committee. I have no more voice than any other member of the committee. As far as I am individually concerned, I would be willing to do it.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Probably a meeting of the committee could be held between now and the hour of meeting Monday, and we might arrange that.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Some of the members of the committee may be absent. I want to say further that I am a member of the legislative committee of the Grand Army of the Republic. The Grand Army of the Republic to-day constitutes about 45 per cent of all the surviving soldiers of the Civil War. At the meeting of the national encampment at Boston last year I was not present. They appointed a legislative committee, with full power to designate what pension legislation should be recommended to Congress for enactment. I met with that committee when they met here previous to the preparation of the present bill. I met with them twice, once before the Senate committee. This bill has been prepared in accordance with the recommendations of that committee of which I am a member, except that ex-Representative Gardner, who was chairman of the committee, said that the amount of money appropriated should not be less than \$40,000,000.

Mr. BLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. BLAND. I suppose Commander in Chief Somers is a member of that committee?

Mr. SHERWOOD. No; he is not a member.

Mr. BLAND. I want to say for the gentleman's information that the Grand Army of the Republic officers have written to me that they were opposed to this bill, and especially opposed to these two features, and that they indorsed the provision of the Smoot bill that is in the Senate.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Some of them might be opposed to any bill that we might enact. I have received as high as 800 letters a day. I have received the indorsement of posts of the Grand Army of the Republic from Ohio to Oregon, favoring the bill now on the Union Calendar. I have received all told about 75 letters against the bill, in favor of a larger bill. Of course, we

are all human. They all want as much money as they can get. You must understand that. I do not blame them. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Does the gentleman desire more time?

Mr. SHERWOOD. No.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON], a member of the committee, is recognized.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHERWOOD], the chairman of the Committee on Invalid Pensions, has just told us how solicitous he is that his general pension bill shall be considered, and how much he desires to have it considered under favorable circumstances for amendment, and so forth. It seems to me that this discussion here, if it has done nothing else, has cleared the way and pointed out to him exactly how he may do it. There is no difficulty whatever in the way. All that is necessary is that we may go ahead reading the bill that we are now considering, finish it this afternoon, and before adjournment the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHERWOOD] will have time and opportunity to move that we go into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the general pension bill, which his committee has reported out. It will thus become the unfinished business for next week, and we shall not have to invade suspension day to consider it under suspension of the rules. [Applause.] The way is now perfectly clear, and if we are forced to consider this bill under suspension of the rules, it will be because those in control of it shut their eyes to the opportunities that are before them. It will be because they persist in considering it under suspension of the rules, where it can not be amended, instead of under more favorable circumstances.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TILSON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GARNER. It was the distinct understanding before we went into the consideration of this bill that this would be the last business considered to-day. The question was asked by the leader on that side of the House [Mr. GILLET], and it was distinctly stated that we would not do any more business to-day. I think it would be entirely unfair to those Members of the House who are not here to take up other legislation after that positive statement has been made.

Mr. TILSON. Of course, gentlemen's agreements ought to be kept, but I was speaking of the parliamentary situation; and so far as the rules and orders of the House are concerned, I have stated the facts just as they are. Immediately after the completion of the Military Academy bill this afternoon, if those in charge of the pension bill will call it up, we can begin the consideration of it. By so doing it will become the unfinished business. There is no justification for our being forced to consider it under suspension of the rules next Monday.

Mr. BLAND. Under any circumstances it is not necessary for the chairman of the committee to move to suspend the rules on Monday, is it?

Mr. TILSON. Certainly not. The rules are clear that at any time when an appropriation bill is not pending or some other legislation being considered, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHERWOOD] can arise in his place and move that the House go into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of his pension bill. He can do it if the Speaker will recognize him and he has the votes to back him up. I think the gentleman has the votes to back him up on this pension bill at any time he may wish to call it up. So if we go ahead and consider it under unfavorable circumstances it will be simply because those responsible for the bill do not make proper effort to consider it under favorable circumstances. That is the situation, gentlemen. Let the responsibility be placed where it belongs. I shall not take up more time, and hope we may now go on with the consideration of the Military Academy bill. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be considered as withdrawn, and the Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

For pay of one battalion sergeant major, Infantry, \$864: *Provided*, That the enlisted man in the headquarters, United States Corps of Cadets, performing that duty has the rank, pay, and allowances of that grade: *And provided further*, That if performing the above duties at time of retirement the said enlisted man shall be retired with the rank, pay, and allowances of a retired sergeant major, Infantry.

By unanimous consent Mr. SHERWOOD and Mr. BLAND were given leave to revise and extend their remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. PRATT. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that my colleague [Mr. PRATT] has seldom asked for time in the House,

I ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to speak for 10 minutes additional.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. Hicks] that his colleague may continue for 15 minutes?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRATT. Mr. Chairman, it is a little more than a year since the United States entered into war against Germany, and since then our hearts, our hopes, and our resources in men and money have been thrown into the scale with our brave allies overseas, who for almost four years have been contesting the ground inch by inch with a highly organized and efficient military foe. Little did we think the twentieth century would usher in the most gigantic strife of all time. The world a few years ago looked peaceful enough, but we see now what we were unable to discern then, that for many years all the energies of a great people—the Germans—had been bent toward the single object of world dominion. When the time was ripe Germany stripped off her mask and struck her long-planned, long-prepared blow, hoping by the very suddenness and fury of its onset to overcome France, and then to take on England, while Austria-Hungary kept back the hosts of Russia. But little Belgium—God bless her!—whose neutrality had been violated as by a thief in the night, interposed her arm, and with a gallantry unsurpassed stayed the robber legions in gray which swarmed upon her fair land until France had time to rally and stopped the mighty rush of the invaders at the Battle of the Marne. And so the tide of conflict has ebbed and flowed until to-day there are but few neutral nations, and this has indeed become a world war. Never before has so much blood been spilled; never has this world seen such shame and such glory. But the shame has proceeded from our brutal and barbarous foe and the glory from those who are in a life and death struggle with that foe.

It is unnecessary to review the causes that led the United States to become an active participant in this great war, but we went in because Germany would not let us stay out. We made every honorable effort to stay out. We were a peace-loving Nation; we had been taught by our first President to avoid entangling foreign alliances; in our geographical isolation we felt secure from attack by a foreign foe; but slowly and imperceptibly we were drawn against our will into the maelstrom until we have become a part and parcel of the contending forces. America's aims and purposes in this crisis were never more clearly stated than by the President of the United States in his famous war message delivered in this Hall on the evening of April 2, 1917, and his closing sentences have much of the solemn and majestic sweep of Lincoln's second inaugural:

It is a fearful thing to lead this great, peaceful people into war. But right is more precious than peace, and we shall fight for the things which we have always carried nearest to our hearts—for democracy, for the right of those who submit to authority to have a voice in their own governments, for the rights and liberties of small nations, for a universal dominion of right by such a concert of free peoples as shall bring peace and safety to all nations and make the world itself at last free. To such a task we can dedicate our lives and our fortunes, everything that we are and everything that we have, with the pride of those who know that the day has come when America is privileged to spend her blood and her might for the principles that gave her birth and happiness and the peace which she has treasured.

In the past year the American Congress has sought almost unanimously and by every means at its command to frame and put into effect measures that will help to win the war. We on this side of the House, who are proud of our political heritage as members of the great Republican Party, have shown a oneness with those of our friends of another political faith. We have known no North, no South, no East, no West; but we have devoted ourselves in common to the great task of organizing the resources of the United States for victory. After entering the war in April last year the Congress in May passed the selective-service law; in June, pursuant to the President's proclamation, nearly 10,000,000 Americans, the flower of our young manhood, were registered for service; in August the first quotas were ready to report; in September they began to reach the various cantonments; in October training was under way to provide a great National Army.

Remarkable progress has been made in the last year in many departments of governmental activity; if in all of them the most complete success has not been achieved, if in some of them there have been vexatious delays, the fault in large measure has been due probably to the fact that we have been trying in a few months to accomplish the work of years. It took generations of intensive training to make Germany the military power she was in 1914 and is to-day. But our National Army is in the making; it will soon be worthy of American traditions. Many of our soldiers are already on the firing line, and the Kaiser knows he

must secure a military decision, if at all, before the American boys in full force can reach the shores of France.

If in the raising and training of our National Army we are once more showing our unity as a Nation, if we are to-day shaking off the clinging garments of apathy and pacifism and unpreparedness which for more than 50 years have been our national habit, we are in other fields of endeavor striving to meet the exigencies that are a part of our war program. From all over the land are heard the sounds of preparation for the struggle we are in. We are building ships, we are making ammunition, we are providing and conserving food, and we are raising billions in money. We must have not only soldiers and ammunition, but we must have food and the ships to carry it across the ocean; and the American farmer, no less than the American artisan and the American business man, is exhibiting his patriotism in this supreme moment in the world's history.

Of such transcendent importance is the question of food supply in our war program that this Congress a few weeks ago passed an act authorizing the Secretary of War to grant furloughs to enlisted men to enable them to engage in agriculture during the present farming season. By reason of this the men who have left the farms for the training camps can go back to the farms for short periods, largely for seeding and harvesting time. Without universal farm productiveness we can gain no victory over Germany.

I have the honor to represent a district where agriculture is largely pursued. The counties of Steuben, Chemung, Schuyler, Tioga, and Tompkins, in the southern tier of New York, are noted for the extent and volume of their agricultural interests. There are no more intelligent and industrious farmers anywhere in the country, and surely none more loyal to the State and the Nation. In every community they are backing up the Government to the extent of their ability, and they will continue to do so. But they must have labor, and the farm-trained labor that will be released as a result of the furlough act passed by this Congress and approved by the President on March 16, 1918, will assist us to win the war.

There has been some talk of conscripting labor for farm production, but I am a believer in free labor. If male labor can not be obtained, women will doubtless come to the rescue. As always, the burden of war falls hardest on women; but they are uncomplaining and unfaltering, vying with men in the effort to be of assistance in this struggle. "Without the aid of women, England could not carry on this war," said Mr. Asquith, former premier. English women, to a large degree, are replacing in the factories and mills, in the public utilities, and on the farms of England the men who have been taken away to fight the Germans. As time goes on and this war takes from America its millions of men, the women of America will demonstrate their adaptability and their readiness to meet the emergency at home; for when have the women of America ever failed to show their patriotism, their heroism, and their self-sacrifice? All that they ask is an open field, an even start, and no favors; and now that in many States they do not lack citizenship and are soon, I trust, to attain citizenship in the Nation at large, they will prove not only the allies but the equals of men.

The boys in the trenches have a clear idea of what they are there for. They know they are fighting not only for democracy and to make the world free but for something very near and dear to them at home. We can almost hear them saying, in the words of a recent war verse:

"Made safe for democracy" seems mighty fine,
But high-soundin' politics ain't in our line.
Taint that made us chuck up our jobs and enlist
For givin' the Kaiser the taste of a fist,
But this is the notion stowed under our lids:
We're makin' it safe for the missus and kids.

[Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

For pay of one battalion sergeant major, Infantry, \$——: *Provided*, That the enlisted man at headquarters, United States Military Academy, performing that duty shall have the rank, pay, and allowance of that grade.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, in the print of the bill the amount after the dollar mark was unintentionally omitted, and I ask to amend the bill by adding the figures "768" after the dollar mark.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 10, line 2, after the dollar mark, insert the figures "768."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Total, current and ordinary expenses, \$184,605.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I simply want to say a few words on this bill itself

and not on any pension legislation or any other extraneous matter whatever.

Mr. FESS. That is peculiar; is not that out of order?

Mr. PLATT. It is peculiar. I do not know whether it is in order to speak on the bill before the House or not, but somebody ought to discuss it a little, and West Point is in my district. This is peculiarly a detailed bill and it runs along with a rapidity in the Clerk's reading that takes your breath away when you attempt to follow it. There are some things about which I would like to ask a question or two. In the report of the committee, for instance, I find that the estimates of the Military Academy officials and the War Department have been very greatly cut down. The total estimates were \$5,715,000 and the bill carries an appropriation of \$2,320,000, which means, of course, that the construction program recommended to provide for the increased corps of cadets has been entirely or almost entirely cut out. The new buildings which are absolutely necessary for the enlargement of the academy, to provide for the number of cadets which must be obtained for the Army, have been abandoned for the time, and there has merely been an increase in the mess hall so that the cadets who come in the next year, the enlarged new class, will have some place to eat. I regret the cutting down of the construction, but I have no doubt the committee had good reasons for its action.

Now, in connection with that there is submitted here a table showing the number of vacancies in the cadet corps which I think is wholly misleading. May I have the attention of the chairman of the committee? In connection with the explanation of why the building program is cut down there is given a list of vacancies here showing 591 vacancies in the academy. The gentleman does not mean to say that there are 591 actual vacancies in the corps of cadets at West Point at this time, surely?

Mr. DENT. Of course, there are, according to the complete number Congress authorized in 1916, 1,332.

Mr. PLATT. I submit that can hardly be true. This is the same list of vacancies which you will get, I think, if you write The Adjutant General asking for a list of vacancies at West Point, and embraces cadets who will graduate this summer. It includes every district where appointment is made this year, though the actual vacancies will not be there until the end of this academic year. There have been usually in former years 100 or so vacancies only.

Mr. DENT. These figures were given to me by The Adjutant General's office through the superintendent of the Military Academy.

Mr. PLATT. I know, exactly—

Mr. DENT. The gentleman will recognize under the law we passed in 1916 doubling the academy that the total number of cadets finally to be authorized is 1,332.

Mr. PLATT. Yes.

Mr. DENT. Now, they had 688 there when the superintendent of the academy appeared before the committee.

Mr. PLATT. Well, but the number of appointments to make that total number of 1,300 cadets has not yet been fully authorized. That number of vacancies, I am practically sure, includes all districts which have appointments this year. It includes two appointments from my district, for instance. The boys are already appointed, have taken their examinations, but will not enter the academy until June.

Mr. DENT. There is no doubt of that.

Mr. PLATT. There are other cadets in their places, or would be normally. As a matter of fact, one of my cadets was dropped. I simply wanted to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that the figures do not represent the actual vacancies in the academy at the present time.

Mr. DENT. There are vacancies until they go there.

Mr. PLATT. But the vacancies are not there yet. It merely means there are appointments to be made to fill vacancies which will occur when the present first class graduates.

Mr. DENT. That may be misleading. I asked the superintendent of the academy to give these figures, and they were given by him after they had conferred with The Adjutant General.

Mr. PLATT. I have followed the matter of vacancies at West Point in Congress from year to year, and I know they range from 60 to 100 or a little more as the year progresses.

Mr. KAHN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLATT. I will.

Mr. KAHN. The paragraph of the report just above that statement of figures will show the gentleman there were at the time of the hearings 688 cadets attending the academy and not over 360 more are expected in June, so that the estimates are based upon 1,000 cadets. Now, that was the information that was given us by the superintendent of the academy.

Mr. PLATT. Well, I think the estimates are probably all right, but I do not understand the vacancies. It gives 366 con-

gressional districts that have vacancies there. Now, that means 366 appointments to be made this year. The most of those boys are there. A few of the districts may have vacancies running through the whole year due to failures in examinations, but most of them are simply appointments to be made in place of cadets who will graduate this coming summer.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLATT. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McKENZIE. On page 12 of the hearings there is some information given. There is a statement made there by Col. Tillman, as follows:

Since January 22, 1917, at which time the strength of the Corps of Cadets was about 697, the following changes have occurred to date:

Discharged for physical disability	11
Discharged for deficiency in studies	53
Graduated	290
Resigned	11
Dismissed	8
Dropped	3
Died	2
Discharged for deficiency in conduct	1
Total	379

Strength January, 1917	697
Separated since	379
Cadets admitted during the year	318
Present strength	688

Now, the committee has estimated that there will be a number to come in, so that we have based our appropriations on 1,000 cadets for the year ending July 1, 1919.

Mr. PLATT. I am not criticizing that fact. I am simply criticizing the statement of vacancies given in the report and as explaining it. It seems to me it does not explain it. I think probably it is true that the number of cadets that will come in will be about as estimated here—360 more. But those 360 that are to come in in June are included, I think, in the 591 here given as vacancies. They are vacancies for the purpose of appointment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. PLATT. I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent for five minutes more. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I will say, as to the gentleman's criticism of these figures, that I put in the report which came from the superintendent after conference with The Adjutant General's office, and he will find it to be absolutely correct when he recognizes the fact that we doubled the capacity of the cadets to 1,332. And when you take the 688 who were in the academy at the time the superintendent and the quartermaster appeared before the Committee on Military Affairs and add the 591, you have got 1,279. Now, the vacancies they meant were the total number of vacancies authorized by law.

Now, I want to make this additional statement?

Mr. PLATT. Does the gentleman mean they could all be filled at the present time?

Mr. DENT. I am going to make a statement that, I think, will satisfy the gentleman.

When we passed the bill doubling the capacity of the academy so as to constitute a corps of 1,332 cadets, at first the department made a regulation that that increase should be in four annual increments. There was so much complaint on that subject by the Members of the House and Senators that the regulation was changed, and Gen. McCain informed me that every Member of Congress was given an opportunity to make an appointment, and that the reason that they are not full up, according to the 1,332, as provided by law, is because of the number of failures of the appointees.

Mr. PLATT. That is very surprising to me, because I know this to be the fact: If you write to The Adjutant General asking for a list of vacancies, with the idea of getting a boy appointed, getting somebody to appoint from another district, you will find your own district included in the vacancies, although you have already appointed your boy. I have had that happen to me over and over again.

Mr. TILSON. If the gentleman will yield, I think if the gentleman will take the trouble to verify it, he will find out that the statement in the report was absolutely correct at the time of the hearings, and that there were that many vacancies at the time. If the gentleman will make the multiplication and addition, multiplying the total number of Members of Congress in both Houses, including Delegates, by two, and add the number of presidential appointments and the number from the National Guard, he will find the total strength is approximately 591 more than the total strength given here—688. Therefore I think

there were at the time this report was made 591 actual vacancies and that there were 360 actual congressional district vacancies.

Mr. PLATT. If that is true—

Mr. TILSON. I think it is absolutely true.

Mr. PLATT (continuing). It makes a worse showing in the congressional districts for the boys we appoint than anything that has happened before. It shows the boys of this country have run down tremendously. I do not think it is true. I think it includes vacancies that are to occur when the present class graduates.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. I want to call the gentleman's attention to this fact, as to the vacancies the gentleman refers to, that we have all made our appointments and this causes vacancies until those men get through and qualify.

Mr. PLATT. It does not, because the man an appointee is to succeed is still there.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. Not when you take into consideration the increase.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I think the gentleman might verify that a little bit when he takes into consideration that this bill is not to provide for existing conditions at West Point, but for the fiscal year beginning with July 1, when the vacancies are to be filled and become operative.

Mr. PLATT. The gentleman states these vacancies were accurate at the time of the hearings. If so, the explanation may be that many of them were created by the graduation of a class last August, a year ahead of time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PLATT. May I ask for two minutes more?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. PLATT. I want to take the two minutes to present a matter, although I do not criticize it, because I think it may be necessary to postpone it for the present, and that is that the old hotel at West Point should be torn down and rebuilt. It was built nearly 100 years ago, and is a disgrace to the country. They had to pile manure around the water pipes to keep them from freezing last winter, and there were only one or two toilets in the house that they could keep from freezing up. The parents of the cadets have no other place to go than to this hotel, and the men are not allowed to go off the reservation. Something ought to be done about this hotel in the near future. I wanted to call attention to that, because I hope when we get a little bit loose from war indebtedness and can do something, we will build a new hotel at West Point, or let somebody else build it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For installation of automatic stokers under four 440-horsepower boilers in the power plant, \$40,000.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. FESS. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee what is the meaning of that first line on page 29?

Mr. DENT. "For installation of automatic stokers under four 440-horsepower boilers?"

Mr. FESS. That is not a misprint, then?

Mr. DENT. No; it is not a misprint. It was misprinted in the original bill, but it was corrected.

Mr. FESS. Then I will use this as an incident concerning which I want to ask the gentleman a question. Has the printing force in the Government Printing Office been greatly disturbed by the draft act? Have many of our expert men been taken out of the Printing Office because of the operation of the draft?

Mr. DENT. I am sorry to say it, but I am absolutely unable to answer that question. I am not familiar with the situation. I have not heard anything of that kind.

Mr. FESS. I presumed that there had gone into the Printing Office a considerable increase of force on account of the war demands for departmental printing and that there must be a considerable number of inexperienced workmen or printers, typesetters, or compositors in the office. I wish to make this observation, that up to the time the war opened it was a very infrequent thing to find a misprint, a misspelled word, or any error, grammatical or otherwise, especially in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I have looked upon it as one of the most remarkable achievements for perfection of work I had ever seen, that the RECORD came so carefully prepared; no matter how late our sessions ran here at night, we would have the RECORD on our desk the next morning, and it was almost error proof. But I have noticed a good many typographical errors in the last year. In the mineral bill considered recently Members commented upon the great number of

errors, and I wondered whether those errors had crept in because some of the expert men had been taken out due to the demands of the war.

Mr. DENT. I have had no complaint submitted to the Military Committee on that line, although I lost the assistant clerk of the committee the other day—which I regret very much—on account of the draft. But I can not help it.

Mr. FESS. I would not at this time offer any criticism, at least until I had the facts concerning the source, as I do not think it would be proper. But I am going to make this observation, since I am on my feet and this feature of the war's affect is before us, that in public places where we have to deal with men interested in public or quasi-public matters we find a wonderfully pronounced indifference among our public servants in their regard for the public needs, an indifference which is very noticeable when compared with what we had prior to the war. Take, for example, the railway depot down here and the men the traveling public have to deal with. It is either because they are overworked, or because they are inexperienced, or else because they are inclined to be ungentlemanly, a characteristic which is developed by a situation in which they know the public can not help itself. Whatever may be the cause, it is quite difficult to receive any sort of courteous treatment in matters in which the public heretofore had been so decently treated. Even were it necessary to overlook the most palpable discourtesies, that does not justify the insolence so frequent in recent months. I think I had to stand for five minutes once in the railway depot waiting for a man who was selling me a ticket to tell me what the rate was to the place I was going. He did not even know where the city was, and he had difficulty to find out. He did not know how to examine the Railway Guide, as it appeared to me. In making some inquiry I found that he was a new man, who had just gone in, and consequently I felt inclined to excuse what would otherwise be positively intolerable treatment of the public, although I did feel in a critical mood. I am of opinion the same thing is true in many of our public offices in many places. In other words, that is one of the great prices we are having to pay for this war—taking away our efficient, aggressive, and faithful young men, upon whom the public has had to rely, and who seemed to enjoy the ability and pleasure of serving the public as a duty for which they were paid by their employers. But to-day others have come in, untutored as to what the public demands and wholly careless of what it must have. They seem to be absolutely irresponsible as to any matters of public interest, for which they are employed, and wanting in common courtesy when you ask them questions that the public has a right to know and they ought to decently answer.

I repeat that I do not think that this is a proper place nor time to air our complaints, but I think that a good many unnecessary injuries are suffered by the public that could and should be avoided. In railroadng every man who travels must have noticed the marked indifference to public rights since the Government has taken over the roads. In that degree we are justified in calling attention to the situation. Only this week I took a lady from a hospital and placed her on a train. We had but a few moments in which to exchange a claim check for the necessary check for her trunk. As a precaution I notified the young man that I had but a few moments to assist a sick lady to the train and requested expedition, that she might not be overtaxed. But the young lady by his side was of more interest than my request. In war time, when we can not help ourselves, we must submit, but it ought not to occur where the Government can avoid it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For installation of mechanical soot blowers in six 440-horsepower boilers in the power plant, \$3,600.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. This morning a little incident occurred which I think it wise to correct. I do not like to disagree with my good friend from Kansas [Mr. LITTLE], but he quoted me as saying something, and it occurred, as I understand it, wholly through a misunderstanding. It is true that he did stop me in the hall when I was walking down the hall very fast and asked me in regard to something, and I understood him that he asked in regard to a statement that Gen. March had made before the Committee on Military Affairs, which had to do with something altogether different from what he understood it did.

Now, in order that there may be no misunderstanding in regard to the matter, I will take the liberty of putting into the RECORD and reading to you just exactly what Gen. March did say. I think this is fair to the House and fair to everyone else.

The CHAIRMAN. May I ask the gentleman if that was a statement before the committee?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. DENT. It is subject to the rule, but I do not think there is any objection that will be made. The statement has not been printed yet.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read.

The CHAIRMAN. It is not a matter of particular concern to the Chair, but it seems that under the rule, as the Chair now remembers it, the Chair should even take the initiative, if necessary, to prevent any statement of what occurred in committee being made. That is the position of the Chair.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, this matter, as I remember, is not very material, and I do not think any harm will be done if the gentleman from Iowa is permitted to quote from the hearings.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that that may be done.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has no special interest in the matter. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that the statement be read. Is there objection?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I want to make a parliamentary inquiry. I would like to inquire whether it is not perfectly proper for the gentleman to read from the printed hearings?

Mr. DENT. The hearings have not been printed.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. LITTLE. Will the gentleman yield for a moment? I may say in that connection that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY] suggested to me, since I spoke this morning, that the remarks which Gen. March made to him were not a part of the record but were made informally. That is how the misunderstanding between the gentleman and myself arose. He thought I was referring to the record, and so did I, but I found that Mr. ANTHONY indicated that it was a sort of informal conversation, evidently during a lull in the proceedings. That explains how the statements were made. I do not want to interrupt the gentleman, except to make that statement.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. With that statement it is hardly necessary for me to read what I was going to read.

Mr. LITTLE. I wish the gentleman would.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. But I think it will set Gen. March right, and I will read into the RECORD just what he said, in answer to an inquiry by the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. GREENE]. Gen. March said:

Gen. MARCH. Exactly that.

Mr. GREENE. It will be a continuous and steady flow?

Gen. MARCH. Yes. We are finding it is not necessary to keep them in the camps on this side as long as we anticipated, but that they can be quickly sent to the other side and complete their training over there.

That is exactly my understanding of what was said.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For material and labor for repair of Field Artillery target range, clearing grounds for targets and firing positions for batteries, constructing roads and trails to firing positions and target range; and for miscellaneous expenses connected with the indoor instruction of cadets in field artillery during the winter season, \$500.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer a committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 33, line 11, after the figures "\$500," insert "for Quartermaster's Corps garage, \$10,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For enlarging the Military Academy to accommodate the authorized number of cadets: Construction of cadet barracks and headquarters, to be located at the south of the area of the old or south barracks, \$444,000.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. It is a great source of satisfaction to me to see the repairs and improvements being made at that beautiful spot on the west side of the Hudson River known as West Point. I have had the pleasure of being there to see several young men in whom I was deeply interested graduate. The improvements which have been going on there for the last few years have been very marked and have beautified the place wonderfully, adding materially to the facilities for the work accomplished there. I am very pleased also to see that these facilities are introduced in the work of that school, to simplify and lessen labor, such as the installation of automatic stokers for boilers and modern methods for removing soot. But this is not what I rose to speak particularly about.

A short time ago the Government took over the 1,000-ton barge canal recently completed in the great State of New York for the purpose of facilitating the movement of freight and the conservation of transportation. I want to say to the membership of the House that, in my judgment, unless some arrangement is made for proper facilities at the terminals in the different towns, villages, and cities through which this canal runs it will do very little in the way of adding to transportation facilities. Not more than 15 or 20 years ago practically all the coal for the State of New York, both for manufacturing and domestic use, was delivered by way of the old Erie Canal. In the past few years that method has become obsolete, due to the fact that it is impossible to get labor to unload the boats in the manner in which it was formerly done.

The State has spent \$156,000,000 in the completion of this canal for the benefit of private users. As I say, the Government has recently taken it over for its own use. The suggestion I desire to make is that the terminals along the line of this waterway, and which have been built by the State, should be so arranged that coal can be removed from the barges which it is proposed to build, so that the State of New York, New England, and all other sections of the country in that locality may be supplied with coal through the canal.

It can be done by arrangement such as is made for removing ore from the lake boats at terminal points. These facilities could be established at each terminal to handle coal from barges by practically the same system that is now used in taking the coal from coal cars and elevating it into coal bins for the purpose of shooting it down into trucks for delivery.

This is a subject in which I think every Member here is interested. I am making these remarks for the purpose of bringing the matter to the attention of the Director General of Railroads and his department, and to give the membership of this House the benefit of the knowledge of the fact that the canal facilities are there, and that if the Government takes advantage of them it will do more to loosen up the congestion throughout the entire country, caused by the lack of railroad facilities, than any other one thing of which I know of to-day. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

Hereafter printing, binding, and blank books required for the use of the United States Military Academy may be done or procured elsewhere than at the Government Printing Office when in the opinion of the Secretary of War such work can be more advantageously done or procured locally, the cost thereof to be paid from the proper appropriation or appropriations made for the Military Academy.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I want to reserve a point of order on that paragraph, beginning with the word "hereafter."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois reserves a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. DENT. This has been carried heretofore.

Mr. FOSTER. This makes it permanent law.

Mr. DENT. I have no objection to striking out the word "hereafter." It has been carried before.

Mr. FOSTER. If the word "hereafter" has been carried heretofore it is already permanent law.

Mr. KAHN. It has been carried.

Mr. FOSTER. Then it is permanent law anyhow, so I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Total, buildings and grounds, \$776,693.30.

Total, Military Academy, \$2,277,294.25.

Mr. DENT. I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk may correct the totals to conform to the amendments which have been agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that the Clerk may correct the totals of the bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENT. I move to strike out lines 10 and 11, on page 34. They are unnecessary.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DENT: Page 34, strike out lines 10 and 11.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DENT. I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The motion of Mr. DENT was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and Mr. RUSSELL having assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 11185) making appropriations for the support of the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and for other purposes, and had directed him to report the same back with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

There was no demand for a separate vote, and the amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. DENT, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. LITTLE, by unanimous consent, was given leave of absence indefinitely, on account of the illness of his father, who is 88 years of age.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Monday, May 6, 1918, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, together with report of Col. W. H. Heuer, United States Army, retired, on preliminary examination of Berkeley Harbor, Cal. (H. Doc. No. 1076); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

2. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a summary of reports transmitted by collectors of customs and brief statement of the action of the department in respect to accidents sustained or caused by barges while in tow through the open sea during the fiscal year 1917 (H. Doc. No. 1077); to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. EMERSON: A bill (H. R. 11931) to punish profiteers, spies, and dynamiters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANDALL: A bill (H. R. 11932) to provide further for the national security and common defense, and to conserve foodstuffs, fuel, and transportation facilities by prohibiting importation, exportation, or interstate shipments of certain articles; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SANFORD: A bill (H. R. 11933) providing for the appointment of members of the Capitol police force in accordance with the civil-service law; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. KETTNER: A bill (H. R. 11934) to authorize the establishment of a fisheries experiment station on the coast of California; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PETERS: A bill (H. R. 11935) to establish the Mount Desert National Park in the State of Maine; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SHALLENBERGER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 289) for the appointment of four members of the Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GRIFFIN: Resolution (H. Res. 337) requesting the Secretary of the Navy to transmit to the Speaker of the House of Representatives information as to the persons employed by the Navy Department or the bureaus thereunder at a salary of \$1 per year; the name, address, and trade, industry, or business of the concerns loaning such employees, and the pay or emolument received by such employee from said concerns; whether such have any contracts with the Navy Department or any of the bureaus thereunder, and, if so, the detailed number, kind of

material, amount of contract, what part is complete and what remains to be completed, and the amount of money paid, and what is still owing; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 11936) granting a pension to James Clinger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BEAKES: A bill (H. R. 11937) granting an increase of pension to Duffy Duquette; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 11938) granting an increase of pension to Henry S. Robert; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. COX: A bill (H. R. 11939) granting an increase of pension to Adam E. Robbins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11940) granting a pension to Samuel M. Vawter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMLIN: A bill (H. R. 11941) granting an increase of pension to John Wesley Green; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KETTNER: A bill (H. R. 11942) to reimburse E. T. Thing and S. A. Thing for losses and damages sustained by them by the negligent dipping of their cattle by the Bureau of Animal Industry, Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WINGO: A bill (H. R. 11943) granting a pension to Mary Scott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HELVERING: A bill (H. R. 11944) granting an increase of pension to John H. Crabb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: Papers accompanying a bill granting a pension to Henry S. Roberts; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CARY: Petition of Periodical Publishers' Association, against increase in second-class postal rates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Petition of the Crockery Board of Trade of New York, protesting against the repeal of the zone postage rates for periodicals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, urging adequate punishment of spies and enemy agents; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ESCH: Papers in support of House bill 11885, granting an increase of pension to William D. Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOCHT: Evidence in support of H. R. 10675; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOSTER: Petition of citizens of Iuka, Ill., protesting against the increase of postage on second-class mail; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of 24 members of the Young Women's Christian Association and of 60 students of the Northern Illinois State Normal School, at De Kalb, Ill., asking for the repeal of the increased postage on periodicals; also a petition of Hibbard, Spencer, Bartlett & Co., of Chicago, opposing the repeal of the zone rates of postage on advertising matter in periodicals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRIEST: Petition of members of Lancaster (Pa.) Medical Society, urging passage of House bill 9563, relative to rank of commissioned Army Medical Reserve Corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of Presbytery of Westminster (Lancaster, Pa.), urging legislation to amend the Constitution relative to polygamy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYES: Memorial of Greenfield (Monterey County, Cal.) Grange, No. 357, Patrons of Husbandry, against the zone postal-rate system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of California State Conference of Social Agencies, Santa Barbara, Cal., favoring immediate prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILLIARD: Petition of John V. Barker and 19 others, all citizens of the State of Colorado, praying for prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: Resolutions of the Board of Trustees Tacoma (Wash.) Public Library, and of the Tacoma

Central Labor Council, favoring the repeal of the zone postal system for periodicals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAHER: Petition of Local Union No. 69, International Brotherhood of Stationary Firemen, Millinocket, Me., protesting against the Senate amendment to H. R. 10358; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, relative to the treatment of spies and enemy agents; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERS: Petition of Eastport Woman's Club, of Eastport, Me., for repeal of zone-rate system on second-class mail matter; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RAKER: Resolution adopted by the Associated Chambers of Commerce of the Pacific Coast, in regard to the development of foreign commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolutions adopted by the California State Medical Society, in regard to the rehabilitation of injured persons; to the Committee on Education.

Also, telegram by Howard Robertson, president board of public service commissioners, Los Angeles, Cal., indorsing bills relating to water supply of city of Los Angeles, Cal.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: Papers to accompany House bill 11429; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, resolutions adopted by the Idaho Association for the Study and Prevention of Tuberculosis, urging the enactment of House bill 9563 providing for increased rank in the Medical Service of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE.

MONDAY, May 6, 1918.

Rev. J. L. Kibler, of the city of Washington, offered the following prayer:

O God, we praise Thee for Thy boundless mercy. In all the past Thou hast dealt with us most graciously. Thou hast favored our land from the very beginning, when we built an altar unto the Lord. Thou hast given us great prosperity and our commerce has blessed the world. But alas, in the enjoyment of our abundance, we have too often forgotten Thee and gone after other gods. We have forgotten the source whence cometh our help, and now Thou art reminding us of our folly, and the thought of Thy goodness is leading us to repentance. Thou art calling us back to Thyself. Thou art calling us into service for the benefit of mankind and for the preservation of the principles that pertain to Thy kingdom.

O God, may we heartily respond to the call of Thy providence. May we be glad to turn our vast treasures back to Thee and to lay all we have upon the altar of sacrifice. Our thought, our money, our skill, our prayers, ourselves—may we give all to Thee for service in the cause of righteousness and for the restoration of peace to a long-distracted world. We ask it for the sake of Jesus, the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Thursday, May 2, 1918, when, on request of Mr. VARDAMAN and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by C. F. Turner, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 10264. An act to prevent in time of war departure from or entry into the United States contrary to the public safety; and

H. R. 11185. An act making appropriations for the support of the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and for other purposes.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I think Senators will agree that the pride one has in the good achievements of his own State is quite pardonable. I hold in my hand a clipping showing what my State has done in the matter of liberty-loan subscriptions. I think it worthy a place in the Record. It reflects not only the spirit of South Dakota but the spirit of the West generally. I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read from the desk.

The Secretary read as follows:

[From the Sioux City Journal.]

A NEIGHBOR'S GRACIOUS COMPLIMENT.

All you have to do for South Dakota is to give her a mark to shoot at. In the first liberty-loan campaign the organizers of the drive in the ninth reserve district, having an opinion of South Dakota resources

and of her will to use them that must look sort of funny now, asked the State to subscribe a million and a half. The State did, plus enough to bring the total up to almost \$4,000,000. In the second liberty-loan effort South Dakota was asked to produce ten millions. The figure actually reached was close to \$13,000,000. Along came the third bond issue, and the gentlemen at the Minneapolis headquarters, gulping noticeably, suggested that \$22,000,000 would be about right.

South Dakotans, including those particular South Dakotans on whom responsibility for scraping up the \$22,000,000 of loose change chiefly devolved, gulped, too, and asked Minneapolis what was the matter. As soon as explanations were made, however, the drive began. And, lo, just as the first \$1,500,000 allotment was raised and bettered, just as the second \$10,000,000 quota was bettered, too, so the third sum, being \$22,000,000, was produced without turning a coyote's hair. It is expected that something like \$28,000,000 will be South Dakota's bit in this effort, as South Dakota herself perceives it.

Now hymns of praise are being sung in the citadel. A. B. Rogers, ninth district campaign director, is acting in a way as choir-master. The sense of the song is something like "South Dakota Ueber Alles," though of course nobody would think of expressing it in just that fashion. Among the things that the State has done, it appears, are these:

She was the first State in the district to report officially to the Federal reserve bank an oversubscription of the allotment.

She obtained probably the highest percentage of distribution, population considered, in the district.

She subscribed more generously than any other State of the district, resources considered.

She exceeded her subscription to the second loan by a greater percentage than any other State in the Nation, the increase being more than 100 per cent.

Perhaps conflicting claims will be offered by other States with regard to these points of superiority. That will not make any essential difference. South Dakota assuredly has seen her duty and has done it. Not that there was any real question about that. Indeed, there was none. There is no need to call attention to the performance of Iowa along the same line. And Sioux City can not bear any longer to mention her own humble achievements. But it's a pretty comfortable corner of God's country out here. The New York press may be expected to throw another surprise and happy fit to discover that the West is still, with both feet, in the war. We shan't. With us it's a commonplace.

Bring on your loans.

Mr. GALLINGER. In connection with the article just read, Mr. President, I want to say that the little State of New Hampshire has also oversubscribed the loan and is ready for another.

Mr. President, I have had a great many telegrams in reference to a provision in the naval appropriation bill, to which I offered an amendment, which is now in print and before the committee, proposing to strike out a provision known, I think, as the Taylor efficiency system, which has been placed in bills heretofore, and which it is proposed to place in the naval appropriation bill. I have simply taken from my desk four or five telegrams from business concerns, mostly in my own State, and I ask that they may be inserted in the Record without reading.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

MANCHESTER, N. H., April 30, 1918.

Senator JACOB GALLINGER,
Washington, D. C.:

We strenuously condemn antiefficiency rider penalizing bonus and premium payments and time studies in naval appropriation bill just passed. Trust you will use your every influence against similar rider in Senate bill.

LEWIS DEXLER.

DOVER, N. H., April 30, 1918.

Hon. JACOB H. GALLINGER,
Washington, D. C.:

We note the naval appropriation bill with antiefficiency rider attached has been passed by the House. In view of the absolute necessity of speeding up operations, we most earnestly protest against passage of bill with this rider by the Senate. Sincerely hope it will have your active opposition.

B. WILLIAMS & SONS.

NEWPORT, N. H., April 30, 1918.

Senator JACOB H. GALLINGER,
Washington, D. C.:

We enter our protest against the antiefficiency rider in naval appropriation bill. We feel that at this time every effort should be used to increase rather than diminish the country's producing capacity.

EMERSON PAPER CO.

MILFORD, N. H., May 3, 1918.

JACOB H. GALLINGER,
Washington, D. C.:

The antiefficiency rider penalizing premium and bonus payments was surely made in Germany. Our boys across the water are crying, "Speed up." Can't you hear them? We look to our Senators to protect them and us from such vicious legislation.

FRENCH & HEALD CO.

Mr. SHIELDS. Mr. President, concerning the allotment of liberty bonds and subscriptions therefor in the several States, to which Senators have been referring, I could have made an announcement of this kind on the second day of the loan, which I will now do. In one of the counties of Tennessee, that of Unicoi, on the first day, before 9 o'clock in the morning, double the quota of the county was subscribed, and I have no doubt that exceeds the record of any other county in the United States. There are no more loyal people in the Union than those of Tennessee, and the prompt action of Unicoi County fairly represents the spirit prevailing all over our State.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, I have felt modest about claiming good things for the Green Mountain State, but I feel that it is